Daily Report

Near East & South Asia

FBIS-NES-93-183
Thursday
23 September 1993

Daily Report
Near East & South Asia

FBIS-NES-93-183 23 September 1993

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Inter-Arab Affairs

Jordan, PLO Agree on Palestinian Voting Rights *[Paris Radio Monte Carlo]* 1

Palestinian Affairs

PFLP-GC's Jibril on Opposition to PLO Accord *[Al-Quds Palestinian Arab Radio]* 1
UN Mission Ordered To Halt Contacts With Israelis *[AL-RAY 23 Sep]* 5
'Source' on Qaddumi's Stance on Accord *[London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT 19 Sep]* 5
'Arafat Appoints Self Chief of Security Forces *[Amman Radio]* 5
Names Unit Commanders in Gaza, Jericho *[AL-DUSTUR 23 Sep]* 6
PLO Opens 6 Offices in Territories *[YEDI'OT AHARONOT 22 Sep]* 6
Egyptian Guards in Tunis To Boost Security *[AFP]* 6
Fatah: Hamas Not Involved in Attorney's Death *[Paris Radio Monte Carlo]* 6
Hamas Condemns Abu-Sha'ban Murder *[AFP]* 7
'Internecine Feud' Within Fatah Denied *[AFP]* 7
Editorial Deplores Death of Abu-Sha'ban *[AL-NAHAR 22 Sep]* 8
Fatah, Hamas Aides Differ on Existence of Pact *[London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT 18 Sep]* 8
Paper Gives Further Details on Latest Intifadah 'Call' *[AL-RAY 22 Sep]* 9
'Arafat Asks People To Support Agreement With Israel *[Algiers VOP]* 9
PLO's 'Abbas on Agreements, Peace Process *[London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT 17 Sep]* 9

ARAB AFRICA

Egypt

Al-Asad, Mubarak Discuss Arab Developments 12
Hold Expanded Meeting 22 Sep *[Damascus Radio]* 12
Al-Asad Honored at Banquet *[SANA]* 12
Mubarak, Al-Asad Hold News Conference *[Cairo TV]* 12
Further on News Conference *[MENA]* 13
Al-Asad Departs 22 Sep *[MENA]* 14
Mubarak Discusses Peace Moves With AL-MUSAWWAR *[MENA]* 14
Mubarak Queried on Peace, Lockerbie, Iran *[MENA]* 16
Sources Cited on U.S. Aid, Musa Washington Visit *[MENA]* 16
Muslim Scholars Praise Palestinian-Israeli Accord *[AKHIR SA'AH 15 Sep]* 17

Libya

Tripoli 'Prepared' To Hand Over Lockerbie Suspects *[Madrid Radio]* 17
Arab League Stance on Libya-West 'Crisis' Hailed *[Tripoli TV]* 17
Al-Qadhdhafi Addresses Awlad Abu Sayf Citizens *[Tripoli TV]* 17
Foreign Liaison, Cuban Officials Hold Talks *[JANA]* 19

Morocco

King Hassan Interviewed on Sahara Issue *[MAP]* 19

Sudan

Government Delegation Leaves for Talks With Rebels *[AFP]* 20
Official Says Relief Flights to South Continue *[SUNA]* 21
Civilians Appointed To Replace Military Governors *[London AL-HAYAH 17 Sep]* 21
Al-Bashir Reaffirms Stand on PLO-Israeli Accord *[Omdurman Radio]* 21
Sudanese-Egyptian Prisoner Exchange Slated *[SUNA]* 21

Tunisia

Israeli Foreign Ministry Team Arrives for Talks *[Jerusalem Radio]* 22
Preparation for Talks Reported *[HA'ARETZ 22 Sep]* 22

ARABIAN PENINSULA

* GCC Debates Financial Aid to Palestinians *[London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT 13 Sep]* 23

Kuwait

Army Chief of General Staff Talks to 'AL-ANBA *[KUNA]* 23

Saudi Arabia

Industrial Development Detailed for National Day *[SPA]* 23

United Arab Emirates

* Dispute With Iran Over Islands Continues *[London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT 11, 12 Sep]* 24

IRAQ

Paper Criticizes 'Arafat's 'Bitter Deception' *[INA]* 25
Further Commentary on 'Arafat, Accord *[INA]* 25
Saddam Meets Swedish Envoy, Orders Release of 3 Swedes *[INA]* 25
Freed Swedes Commend Treatment *[INA]* 26
Recent U.S. Airspace 'Violations' Protested to UN *[INA]* 26
'Spy Plane' Flights Protested *[INA]* 26
Arab League Informed of Allied Airspace 'Violations' 26
12-13 Sep Sorties Reported *[INA]* 26
16-17 Sep 'Violations' Noted *[Baghdad Radio]* 26
18 Sep Sorties Protested *[Baghdad Radio]* 26

ISRAEL

Accord 'In Principle' With Syria Initialed *[AL HAMISHMAR 23 Sep]* 27
'Sources' Deny Reports of Accord *[Tel Aviv Radio]* 27
Rabin Said To Expect Majority Favoring PLO Accord *[Jerusalem Radio]* 27
Knesset Debate From 21 Sep Reported *[HA'ARETZ 22 Sep]* 27
Rabin Views Israel-PLO Accord, Ties With Syria *[London TV]* 28
Katyusha Reportedly Lands in Qiryat Shemona *[Jerusalem Radio]* 29
Shell Possibly Fired by IDF *[Jerusalem Radio]* 29
IDF 'Forcibly' Evicting Settlers in Bet El *[Jerusalem Radio]* 29
Rabin Promises To Consult Settlers on Interim Status *[Jerusalem Radio]* 30
Settlers Demand 'Territorial Continuity' *[Jerusalem Radio]* 30
Councils Propose Settlement Areas in Judaea, Samaria *[Tel Aviv Radio]* 30
IDF Commander, Deputy Defense Minister on Deployment *[Jerusalem Radio]* 30
Fatah 'Terrorists' Apprehended in Gaza Strip 22 Sep *[Jerusalem Radio]* 31

JORDAN

PLO Economic Committee Official Arrives on Visit *[AL-DUSTUR 23 Sep]* 32

Minister Details Passenger Traffic Across Bridges *[Amman Radio]* 32
Information Minister on Israeli Journalists' Entry *[AL-DUSTUR 20 Sep]* 32
Minister Denies Husayn Warning of Yom Kippur Attack *[Jerusalem International]* 33
Islamic Front Official Views Elections, Gaza-Jericho *[AL-DUSTUR 22 Sep]* 33
Mu'tah Trial: First Prosecution Witness Heard *[JORDAN TIMES 21 Sep]* 33

LEBANON

Al-Hariri Cited on PLO Accord, Reconstruction *[Beirut Radio]* 36
Al-Hirawi, al-Asad Discuss Regional Situation *[Beirut Radio]* 36
Islamic Group Claims Responsibility for Firing Katyusha *[VOL]* 36
Resistance Claims Attacks on Lahd Militia 22 Sep *[Voice of the Oppressed]* 36
Further Attack 23 Sep *[Beirut Radio]* 36

SYRIA

AL-AKHBAR Interviews President al-Asad *[20 Sep]* 37
Second Part of al-Asad Interview *[AL-AKHBAR 21 Sep]* 43
Al-Asad, Delegation Return to Damascus 22 Sep *[Damascus Radio]* 48
Al-Asad's Egypt Visit, AL-AKHBAR Interview Noted *[Damascus Radio]* 48

SOUTH ASIA

India

Rao Views Visit to Iran, Pakistan Ties *[Delhi Radio]* 49
Officials Discuss Implementation of Accord With PRC *[INDIAN EXPRESS 14 Sep]* 49
Editorial Comments on Rao Visit to China *[ANANDABAZAR PATRIKA 11 Sep]* 49
Vice President Leaves for Visit to Vietnam *[Delhi Radio]* 50
'Better Appreciation' of Kashmir Issue by U.S. Seen *[INDIAN EXPRESS 10 Sep]* 50
Militants Seen as Pressuring Media in Kashmir *[INDIAN EXPRESS 17 Sep]* 51
Czech Consortium To Execute Oil Pipeline Project *[Delhi Radio]* 51
Paper Claims Economic Reform 'Gone Awry' *[INDIAN EXPRESS 16 Sep]* 51
Government To Import 100,000 Tons of Palm Oil *[Delhi Radio]* 52
ISRO Explains Cause of Setback in Launching PSLV *[Delhi Radio]* 52

Iran

Tehran Not To 'Interfere' in PLO-Israel Deal *[IRNA]* 52
Experts Assembly Condemns 'Humiliating' Accord *[IRNA]* 52
Raja'i-Khorasani, UK's Burton Review Human Rights *[IRNA]* 52
UN Bosnia Tribunal Faulted for Lacking Muslims *[Tehran Radio]* 53
ICO 'Silence' Over Somalia 'Bloodbath' Scored *[JOMHURI-YE ESLAMI 12 Sep]* 53
* RESALAT Examines Current U.S. Stance *[19, 21, 22 Aug]* 53
* U.S. Strategy Seen Motivated by Domination *[KEYHAN-E HAVAT 18 Aug]* 59
Moscow-Ankara Moves, Caucasus Situation Viewed *[ABRAR 11 Sep]* 59
Events in Russia, Yeltsin Position Analyzed *[Tehran Radio]* 60
Further on Visit by Indian Prime Minister Rao 61
Khamene'i, Rao Discuss Kashmir *[Tehran Radio]* 61
Rao Addresses Majles Session *[Tehran Radio]* 62
President Comments on Rao Visit *[Tehran TV]* 62
Rao Says Visit 'Successful' *[Delhi Radio]* 63
Joint Statement Issued *[IRNA]* 63
Indian Foreign Minister Meets Velayati *[Tehran Radio]* 63
Velayati Issues Warning on Disputed Islands *[London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT 19 Sep]* 64
President, Germany's Kohl Discuss Bilateral Ties *[Tehran TV]* 64
Communications Firm To Use German Software *[IRNA]* 64
President Marks Anniversary of War With Iraq *[IRNA]* 64
Khamene'i Urges Attention to 'Sacred Defense Week' *[IRNA]* 65
Reza'i on Strategy for Defense Self-Sufficiency *[Tehran Radio]* 65
* Leader of Islamic Movement Party Interviewed *[KEYHAN-E HAVAT 21 Jul]* 65

Newspapers Report Official Appointments 69
• Envoy, Other Officials Named *[KEYHAN-E HAVAI 28 Jul]* 69
• Naval Region I Commander Named *[KEYHAN-E HAVAI 11 Aug]* 69
• Naval Academy Supervisor Chosen *[KEYHAN-E HAVAI 18 Aug]* 69
• Deputy Ministers Appointed *[KEYHAN-E HAVAI 1 Sep]* 69
• Further Appointments Noted *[KEYHAN-E HAVAI 8 Sep]* 69
• Envoy to Bosnia Named *[KEYHAN-E HAVAI 25 Aug]* 70

Pakistan

Spokesman Comments on Kashmir Situation *[Islamabad TV]* 70
India Reportedly Agrees to Talks *[Islamabad Radio]* 71
Need To Counter India's Foreign Policy Moves Seen *[THE NEWS 22 Sep]* 71
Spokesman Condemns Attacks on Soldiers in Somalia *[Islamabad Radio]* 71
Editorial Reiterates 'Unambiguous' Nuclear Stand *[THE NEWS 21 Sep]* 72
Research Laboratory Develops Tank Equipment *[NAWA-I-WAQT 20 Sep]* 72

Sri Lanka

Prohibited Zone Declared Along Northeast Coastline *[Colombo International]* 73
More on Assurance to India *[Colombo International]* 73

Inter-Arab Affairs

Jordan, PLO Agree on Palestinian Voting Rights

JN2209190593 Paris Radio Monte Carlo in Arabic 1710 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Randah Habib dispatch from Amman]

[Text] Jordan and the PLO have agreed that Palestinians displaced since 1967 cannot participate at the same time in the legislative elections in the kingdom and the elections for the interim self-rule authority in the occupied territories.

Dr. Jawad al-'Anani, minister of state for cabinet affairs, told our radio that both sides have agreed on the principle that the displaced should choose between participating in the legislative elections in Jordan, scheduled for 8 November, or in the elections that will bring about the interim self-rule authority in the occupied territories, scheduled to be held in July next year.

Dr. al-'Anani said that the arrangements for implementing this measure will be discussed within the framework of the joint Jordanian-Palestinian committees. He added: These arrangements will also receive priority handling by the PLO Central Council, which will meet in Tunis within the next two weeks.

Al-'Anani said if the Palestinians are informed at the appropriate time that they do not have the right to vote both in Jordan and in the occupied territories, many of them will opt for what is suitable for them. He said that the details of how the agreement will be implemented are still ambiguous. However, he affirmed that emphasis should be placed on the freedom of movement of the voters who wish to participate in the occupied territories elections, after which they can return to Jordan.

The Jordanian side emphasized that his country refuses to be a party to the four-way Palestinian-Israeli-Egyptian-Jordanian committee on the issue of displaced persons within the framework of the Israeli-Palestinian agreement because it refuses to participate in any arrangement that is agreed upon in its absence. Jordan also refuses to have duties imposed on it by a formulation it did not participate in.

After pointing out that Jordan adopted the same stand on the Camp David accords, al-'Anani said this does not mean that Jordan is not ready to cooperate on the issue of the displaced.

Concluding, al-'Anani affirmed that Amman and the PLO agree on the need to adopt the appropriate measures to check the influx of Palestinians into Jordan. He said: Our attention focuses on encouraging Palestinians who have the right to return to go back to their land. The larger their number in the occupied territories, the more their stand to regain their rights at the final stage will become enhanced.

Palestinian Affairs

PFLP-GC's Jibril on Opposition to PLO Accord

JN2209111493 (Clandestine) Al-Quds Palestinian Arab Radio in Arabic 0830 GMT 22 Sep 93

["Text" of interview with Ahmad Jibril, secretary general of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine-General Command, "by correspondents of the German television network, the Middle East correspondent of the U.S. NEWSWEEK magazine, and the correspondent of the Netherlands newspaper, (THE PEOPLE)"—read by announcer]

[Text] [Unidentified correspondent] Many people are aware that the PFLP-GC, in one form or another, began the intifadah with the gliders operation. Now, it is expected that 'Arafat will announce the end of the intifadah. What are your feelings about this.

[Jibril] We actually contributed to igniting the popular uprising in Palestine when it began more than five years ago. Now, 'Arafat is going to Jericho to contribute to stopping this intifadah. However, we will not be giving our Palestinian people their due credit if we say that our operation ignited the popular uprising in 1987. The Palestinian people have been struggling since 1917, that is, for more than 75 years, which is a record for a contemporary people struggling for their freedom.

As a generation, we have completed 28 years of struggle against the Zionist Movement on the Palestinian land. Since 1965, we have been mounting fedayeen operations. We were aware that these actions would not be able to liberate the land, but we had been determined to transform this fedayeen movement into a popular movement by the accumulation of all our struggles and battles between us and Zionism until, we were able, six years ago, to transform these organized fedayeen operations into a popular movement in which all the strata of our people—children, women, peasants, and intellectuals—participated.

If we return to the first week of the intifadah and search in our archives, we would find a statement by Yasir 'Arafat saying verbatim: The Israeli intelligence, and Shin Bet, are inventing disturbances among the Palestinians in order to strike at our people and cause them more pain. This means that 'Arafat branded this intifadah at the beginning of its life as a form of disturbance, that it was a fabrication by the Zionist intelligence. I am not wronging this man. You can return to the archives and easily find this statement. This means that 'Arafat was surprised by this popular uprising and was not behind it.

'Arafat might have had a role to play: namely, spreading a spirit of frustration before the intifadah. He appeared desperate. Therefore, he asked for more concessions from our people at that time—concessions that were commensurate with what he had been seeking to offer at that time. Our people's answer was this popular revolution.

The world press should know that the Palestinian intifadah, which began six years ago, started in the Palestinian camps in the West Bank and Gaza Strip and not by the

original population of these two territories. This means that it was started by the people from the Palestinian territories that were occupied in 1948. The original Gaza people and the townspeople in the West Bank did not react to the intifadah for a month and a half. This means that the intifadah was started by the Palestinian refugees who had been waiting for 25 years so that this armed revolution would realize for them their return to the land from which they were expelled in 1948. Their aim was not to improve the social or health conditions in the camps of Gaza and the West Bank.

Two-thirds of the Gaza Strip people are refugees who were expelled from Yafo, Lodd, Ashdod, and others. Half of the West Bank population are refugees who were expelled from Haifa, Ashqelon, Jerusalem, and other areas occupied in 1948. Therefore, when this intifadah began six years ago, it raised slogans and aims which you can easily find. The people said: We want our right to return to our land. They did not say: We need the United Nations and UNRWA [United Nations Relief and Works Agency] to improve our social and health conditions, opening for us sewage systems or clinics, or schools. They said: We want to return to our homeland from which we were expelled in 1948.

As for the original population of the West Bank and Gaza, they also joined the intifadah because of the existence of the terrible Zionist settlements and the confiscation of their land. They felt that they would become refugees, just like their brothers who were expelled in 1948.

Over the past six years, 'Arafat has tried to ride the wave of the intifadah, trying to contain it. He collected large funds in the name of the intifadah. However, these funds were not to develop it but were meant to corrupt the intifadah's infrastructure. 'Arafat tried to deviate the aims of the intifadah, the political aims for which our people are fighting, and to create projects that had nothing to do with the causes of the intifadah.

[Correspondent] 'Arafat now is promising peace to the Palestinian people. It is clear that you are against this. Do you believe that the intifadah will continue against 'Arafat and his regime? Will there be an intifadah there against what is proposed? What do you propose in this regard?

[Jibril] Our people in Palestine, the West Bank and Gaza, have been put to the test during the past two years since the Madrid conference. They have been put to two tests. Do they support us or 'Arafat? In these two tests, we realized great success. Our people were very responsive to us. They were not responsive to 'Arafat despite the great disinformation in the media. Our Palestinian people in the West Bank and Gaza do not consider that 'Arafat's plan with Rabin will bring peace and justice to them. Therefore, they are rejecting and not supporting it in the territories.

The peace plan that you mention and that 'Arafat and Rabin signed is rejected by our people because it did not realize the minimum demands of our people such as the right to return, removing the settlements from the West Bank and Gaza, the return of Jerusalem, the right of self-determination. Nothing of this was mentioned in the agreement. 'Arafat signed two documents. The first is a letter of recognition of the Zionist entity and its right to live peacefully, as 'Arafat himself put it. 'Arafat pledged to crush the Palestinian opposition.

Some of the very, very moderate Palestinians—the very, very pragmatic Palestinians—consider 'Arafat's signing of the document, recognizing the Zionist entity and its right to live, and his failure to define the borders of this entity as a very grave crime. He could have said in this document: I recognize the State of Israel and its right to live within borders recognized by international legitimacy, that is, the pre-1967 borders for instance, or as enunciated in the 1947 partition resolution. He did nothing of the kind. He recognized the entity in an absolute manner. He did not define boundaries. The Zionist entity is now occupying Arab territories in Palestine, the Golan, and southern Lebanon.

General de Gaulle was more Palestinian than 'Arafat. When a crisis broke out between France and the Zionist entity after the 1967 aggression, Ben-Gurion went to Paris and tried to placate General de Gaulle who was furious because of the aggression. The general told Ben-Gurion: Tell me where your borders are so that we can recognize them and so that you can stop at them. Every day you move on. Now 'Arafat signed the document of recognizing the Zionist entity wherever it goes.

The second document signed by 'Arafat is the limited autonomous administration in the Gaza and Jericho. In this document, 'Arafat agreed to be a commander of a police post under Rabin's command in order to silence, pursue, and crush the intifadah in the Gaza Strip. Rabin did not try to be reserved in Cairo yesterday when he said that 'Arafat is under test: If he succeeds in Gaza and Jericho, we could give him other things. This means that if 'Arafat succeeds in suppressing the Palestinian people, something the enemy forces failed to do, especially in Gaza—which Rabin and Shamir wished would be submerged by the sea—Rabin will take another step and if he does not succeed, Rabin will stop and retreat. This means that now 'Arafat is going to Gaza and Jericho armed to the teeth with Zionist weapons to suppress and stop the intifadah.

If [three-second break in transmission] why 'Arafat needs 30,000 policemen, which he wants to introduce or train, in order to control 350 square km, which is the area of the autonomous region. If this peace is acceptable to our people, then why this great number? Why thousands of policemen?

The Zionist army in Gaza and Jericho—in accordance with an accurate count by us and which you can ascertain—does not exceed 15,000 soldiers and security elements. 'Arafat wants 30,000. Why? If our people view what 'Arafat signed as peace, then he is not supposed to need any police forces. All he would have needed is a group of UN forces. This would be enough. However, our people

know the Americans and the Zionists. This is not peace. It is a new oppression on our people at the end of this century.

[Correspondent] Let us be very clear on the issue of threatening 'Arafat. Do you mean what you say—that someone will kill him? Let us suppose that 'Arafat is present in this room, would you personally kill him?

[Jibril] The Zionists and the Americans are perfectly aware that the people will kill 'Arafat when he enters Gaza and Jericho. These people do not believe in 'Arafat's plan and will tear him apart if they can. All the protection that American and the Zionists will offer will be to no avail. We say that the days will bear us out.

'Arafat could be killed by a Palestinian child, a martyr's wife, a martyr's son, or the heroic women who carry knives and face the Zionist soldiers who are armed to the teeth in the West Bank and Gaza and inside Jerusalem. They stab and kill these soldiers. All of these are waiting to meet 'Arafat.

[Correspondent] Your threat to 'Arafat was given much space by the Western press and much was written on it. As a veteran officer and a leader of a Palestinian faction, do you still mean that? Are you still sticking to your threat?

[Jibril] I frankly say, and I have said before, that our Palestinian people's pioneers, be they from our group or from others, will confront 'Arafat and take him to task for his treason. Khalid al-Islambuli killed al-Sadat despite the fact that al-Sadat recovered all of Sinai for the Egyptians. We must compare.

'Arafat did not recover anything. The Zionists did not withdraw from Gaza or Jericho and our people were not given the right of self-determination. He was unable to extract even one word from Rabin on dismantling one settlement. How can we not expect these people to punish 'Arafat?

[Correspondent] You mentioned Khalid al-Islambuli, an extremist Islamist. You in the PFLP-GC are known to be a leftist socialist revolutionary. Now we hear about your contacts with Iran and Hizballah in Lebanon. Has Arab nationalism or the Arab socialist progressive movement now become part of the Islamic movement? Explain this to us.

[Jibril] Did you Americans have the right to join Stalin in World War II to forge an alliance with communism against nazism, while we as Arabs, whose spirit is Islam, are not allowed to forge an alliance with this spirit? How can this be? Are you, Americans, allowed to support the Muslim Afghan against Najibollah, extending aid and funds to defeat communism in Kabul, while it is impermissible for us to unite as Arabs and Muslims? Is this not strange? I am amazed. We are now trying to mobilize more than 1 billion Muslims in this battle. Time will come when we tell you, O Westerners, you have to choose between your interests with us or your interests with the Zionists. This might not happen in the near future, but this is what we strive to achieve.

[Correspondent] I have heard that you were in Lebanon prior to the recent Israeli operation Israel code-named "Accountability." I was told you were there with Hizballah elements and carried out operations against the security belt. Is this true? Were you personally there coordinating with Hizballah elements prior to the Israeli operation?

[Jibril] Yes, we are fighting. We will not stop fighting against the Zionists, either from southern Lebanon or from the Palestine occupied in 1948 or 1967. Good alliances bind us with Hizballah. We also fight together. There are operations we do not publicize, but they are announced by the national and Islamic movement in southern Lebanon. We announce only those operations in which our comrades are martyred.

[Correspondent] Accordingly, can I conclude that you personally, and not elements belonging to your faction, were in Lebanon and coordinated with Hizballah?

[Jibril] I am still young. I fought and can fight at any time. The Zionists know this. I can be in southern Lebanon any hour or minute to confront the Zionists. The Zionists know this. They tried to ambush me more than once, but they failed.

[Correspondent] It was reported that you were in Iran a few days ago. Is this true?

[Jibril] This is untrue. However, we can go to Tehran anytime. The Iranian leadership told me I can visit Tehran whenever I wish.

[Correspondent] Last week, President Clinton contacted President Hafiz al-Asad. He asked him to intervene to keep the Palestinian organizations quiet. What does this mean to you? How did this affect you?

[Jibril] I do not think President Hafiz al-Asad's sentiments will interact with Clinton's request. Second, you say that what happened was a peace plan. This means that its signatories will benefit from it as long as it is a peace plan. Why are Clinton, Rabin, and 'Arafat afraid that we may sabotage this plan? If this peace is strong, it is supposed that they should not fear us as limited groups. Why do you fear our words, the right of expression? You advocate freedom and democracy, so why don't you want us to speak? Why do Clinton, Rabin, and Mubarak fear our right to self-expression? Why does Rabin shout that the PFLP-GC's al-Quds Radio should be shut down? Does al-Quds Radio fire shells and rockets? It only addresses the people. Rabin is now jamming this radio. He is screaming and asking America to pressure Syria into closing this radio. All this means that what was signed in Washington is not peace, but some sort of an injustice imposed on us.

[Correspondent] What are the limits of armed struggle? Will it be armed struggle against Israel? Will it be armed struggle against America? Will it be armed struggle against 'Arafat? What are the limits, and what is it you did not do?

[Jibril] Regarding struggle against the Zionists, who are occupying our homeland, we will continue to fight them with all means and at any time and place. As for the U.S.

Administration, we undoubtedly consider it hostile to our people. It is supporting our enemy and it is completely biased to it. A proverb says your enemy's friend is your enemy. At home, neither I nor my family use anything small or big that is made in the United States. We are encouraging this spirit within our organization and our Palestinian, Arab, and Islamic people's circles. I do not doubt the fact that the American goods and technology are good and advanced, but I am also sure that if the successive U.S. Administrations had realized where the American people's interests lay, they could have established sound relations with others, particularly the Arab and Islamic nation. Had this happened, I do not think Clinton would childishly beg the Japanese prime minister to rectify the balance of payments between America and Japan.

[Correspondent] You are known to be a military rather than an economic power. What concerns us here is whether the Americans and Europeans will be targeted?

[Jibril] Civilian Americans are certainly not our target. This will never be the case because I have relatives there. They have American citizenship and are living there. Certainly the civilian American and Western people were not and will not be our target in the confrontation. We have high moral values that prevent us from attacking civilian American targets, not out of fear of America. I hope the U.S. Administration will have part of these moral values. In order to kill an armed Somali in Somalia, we see it killing hundreds of children and women there in cold blood. We will not do that. These are the ethics of the U.S. Administration. They are the same ethics of the Zionists, who come with their planes to kill a commando from our organization, but instead kill scores and even hundreds of children and mothers.

[Correspondent] May I ask you a specific question? Could you tell me about any specific military operartions by your organization since the gliders' operation in 1987?

[Jibril] We carried out several operations against the enemy. You can direct this question to the Zionists. Bloodshed between us and the Zionists has not subsided even for a single hour in 28 years.

[Correspondent] America once accused you of being involved in the Lockerbie operation. Then, it said the operation was carried out by Libya. Do you think Libya was behind the operation?

[Jibril] First of all, I would like to comment on this subject. I do not think the U.S. Administration is concerned for the American people and their interests. This is the biggest lie an American citizen can believe. Had they been concerned for the American citizen, they would not have pursued foolish policies against the Third World nations. Accordingly, I believe that they raised the issue of Lockerbie as a floating accusation that can be directed against anyone they wish. They kept saying over a period of four years that Ahmad Jibril was the one who carried out the Lockerbie operation and that they had all the supporting documents. Then they said it was not him. This means the U.S. Administration sought for four years to convince the poor American citizens that it was Ahmad Jibril who killed the Americans in Lockerbie. How poor the American people are! Do you think they are children who can be fooled? Now we say the issue is not that of Lockerbie and Colonel Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi. They want the Libyan oil after getting the Gulf oil. They want to besiege Europe with Libyan oil. They want to see the day when al-Qadhdhafi tells them: I offer you the oil. Then another party will be accused of carrying out the Lockerbie operation.

It is the Mosad that downed the plane, and I am sure of that. I told Col. al-Qadhdhafi four years ago: They are trying to disarm you gradually, and they will not give you anything. I also told him to study Jamal 'Abd-al-Nasir's biography.

[Correspondent] There is something I do not understand. How can you regain Palestine by such a policy?

[Jibril] I do not say I am seeking the impossible. You accept, become convinced, and encourage something. How can a Jew from the former Soviet Union come to Palestine? Bush, who was then a vice president, boasts of doing that. You extended $10 billion to settle the Zionists in Palestine. You accept that, while you refuse to see me return to Palestine, from which I departed when I was 10 years old. You agree to support the Zionists and reject our return. How is this?

[Correspondent] I am not discussing rights; I am discussing policies and ask: How will you return home?

[Jibril] We say there are 75 years of conflict between us and the Zionist movement. When the Balfour Declaration was issued in 1917, there were only 25,000 Jews in Palestine compared with 1.5 million Palestinians. As a nation and people, we have not tired over 75 years. I have sons who are carrying arms against the Zionists. They have actually engaged in face-to-face battles against the Zionist enemy. You can hear our people in the occupied territories. Now there are those who carry explosives and throw themselves at the Zionists, those who drive cars while clutching weapons, and die together with the Zionist enemy. A woman takes a kitchen knife and leaves her children at home in order to slaughter the Zionists. Is this wrong? No, this is our strategy. The conflict between us and those occupying our land should continue. We have neither weakened nor tired. They will tire as the European expeditions of the 10th century were worn out. The crusaders occupied Jerusalem for 75 years. All the European kings came with their armies here and returned defeated. We bet this conflict will continue. We will not tire or feel exhausted. We will pass the banner on from one generation to another. Now, I do not have a magic solution that can carry these people back home, or ask America to bring ships to carry the Zionists back to where they came from.

[Correspondent] We spoke with some factions' leaders. Some of them accept the existence of Israel. Do I understand from you that you do not at all agree to the existence of Israel?

[Jibril] Can I agree to surrender my home, land, and village and say it became Israel? This is impossible.

UN Mission Ordered To Halt Contacts With Israelis

JN2309100993 Amman AL-RA'Y in Arabic 23 Sep 93 p 20

[By 'Awdah 'Awdah]

[Excerpts] PLO Political Department Chief Faruq Qaddumi has instructed the Palestine mission at the United Nations to halt its contacts with the Israeli mission that aim at amending 30 UN resolutions concerning the Palestinian rights, particularly Resolution 194 which stipulates the Palestinian refugees' right to return or compensation. Qaddumi noted that he will soon travel to New York for this purpose.

Taysir Khalid, who recently resigned from the PLO Executive Committee, said that during a telephone conversation he had with him yesterday, Qaddumi promised to halt these contacts. Khalid urged Qaddumi to shoulder his responsibility as Palestine's foreign minister and head of the PLO Political Department and end these free concessions to Israel.

In another development, Talal al-Ramahi, deputy head of the Palestine mission at the United Nations, has threatened to resign in protest against the Palestinian-Israeli contacts between Nasir al-Qudwah, head of Palestine mission, and Gad Ya'aqobi, head of the Israeli mission, which aim at amending several UN resolutions on the Palestine question. Al-Ramahi noted that the Palestine and Israeli missions at the United Nations have begun implementing the secret annexes of the Palestinian-Israeli agreement which annul several UN resolutions. [passage omitted]

It is worth noting that PLO Political Department Chief Faruq Qaddumi will attend the UN General Assembly session, set to be held in New York at the end of September.

'Source' on Qaddumi's Stance on Accord

PM2209172193 London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT in Arabic 19 Sep 93 p 3

[Unattributed report: "Senior Palestinian Source Tells AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT: This Is the Truth About Qaddumi's Position on the Palestinian-Israeli Peace Agreement"]

[Excerpts] London, AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT—A senior Palestinian source has pointed out that [PLO Political Department Head] Faruq Qaddumi's (Abu-al-Lutf) opposition to the Palestinian-Israeli agreement proceeded from his refusal to rely on the partial solution rule and to get around the international resolutions, especially 242 and 338, on the basis of which the peace process was launched. And that he, that is, Abu-al-Lutf, insisted that "there be no ambiguity regarding the Jerusalem issue, settlements, and the elections." On that basis, he opposed and continues to oppose the agreement because it does not include a clear stipulation about the disputed issues "whose discussion the Americans and the Israelis asked us to postpone."

The source, who is described as very close to Abu-al-Lutf, spoke to AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT on condition that he remain anonymous. He said that the idea of east Jerusalem Palestinians' participation in the voting process without contesting the proposed elections as candidates is like the situation of an expatriate who goes to vote at his country's embassy in a certain country. [passage omitted]

Citing PLO Executive Committee sources, the source says that at the committee's meetings Qaddumi listed the ambiguous points in the declaration of principles and the clauses of the Palestinian-Israeli agreement, especially with regard to Jerusalem, which is not mentioned in the clauses of the agreement. He broached the land-for-peace idea, the settlements issue, and the withdrawal of Israeli forces—rather than "the forces"—from occupied areas, rather than "the areas," as well as the issue of Palestinian citizens' participation in the elections in Jerusalem rather than contesting the elections as candidates.

The source adds: Qaddumi spoke at the Executive Committee meeting while holding in his hand a copy of the agreement and the appendixes attached to it. He reviewed it clause by clause, listing the ambiguous points and offering alternative proposals. According to committee sources very close to Qaddumi, his position was principled, open, and frank, namely that the partial solution rule should not be relied on and that there should be no ambiguity regarding the Jerusalem issue, settlements, and the elections. [passage omitted]

According to confirmed information AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT has obtained, Qaddumi is staying in his post as head of the PLO Political Department, in addition to his other tasks, and he will continue his position opposed to the agreement so that the solution will not pass without opposition, as the easiest thing is resignation, which would be flight in every sense of the word—something which Qaddumi will not do.

The information also cites Qaddumi's statement on what was reported about the allocation of roles in the Executive Committee, namely that it is baseless. He describes it as an undesirable interpretation, because the opposition is not to the agreement in principle and to what was endorsed by the Palestine National Council, namely that authority should be established on every inch of territory liberated or from which the enemy withdraws, but our opposition is to the idea of getting around the original stipulations of Resolutions 242 and 338, on the basis of which the peace process was launched and to which the Palestine National Council agreed in its 1991 Algiers session. [passage omitted]

'Arafat Appoints Self Chief of Security Forces

JN2209163093 Amman Radio Jordan Network in Arabic 1500 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] Palestinian President Yasir 'Arafat today issued a decree declaring his assumption of the general command of the Palestinian security forces in Gaza and Jericho. The decree says that the Palestinian president wants to deploy

Palestinian security units in the two areas before the Israeli forces complete their withdrawal from them.

In the decree, President 'Arafat also appoints commanders of security units and their aides.

Names Unit Commanders in Gaza, Jericho

JN2309091493 Amman AL-DUSTUR in Arabic 23 Sep 93 pp 30, 22

[Report by Tawfiq 'Abid]

[Text] Palestinian President Yasir 'Arafat has issued a package of resolutions aimed at facilitating and expediting the transfer of power in the Gaza Strip, Jericho, and the occupied West Bank.

AL-DUSTUR has learned that these decisions principally aim at maintaining security and supporting the pillars of the newborn national authority. Decisions were also made to cut the expenses of Palestinian officials during their visits to fraternal Arab states.

Staff Brigadier General Muhammad 'Abd-Rahim Qudsiyah was appointed commander of the Badr Forces in Jordan, replacing Brigadier General Na'im al-Khatib who was retired two months ago.

Palestine President 'Arafat decided to appoint Muhammad Yusuf al-'Amlah, alias Abu-Khalid al-'Amlah, as commander of the Palestinian national security forces in the West Bank, with Staff Brig. Gen. Muhammad Qudsiyah and Colonel Isma'il Jabr, alias Hajj Isma'il, as assistants.

Brigadier General 'Abd-al-Razzaq al-Majayidah was appointed commander of the Palestinian national security forces in Gaza, with Brigadier General Fakhri Shaqqurah and Brigadier General Ahmad Mafraj, alias Abu-Humayd, as assistants.

On the financial level, 'Arafat decided to ban Palestinian officials from staying at hotels during visits to fraternal states. The decision issued in that regard instructs these officials to stay at the house of the Palestinian ambassador in the country they are visiting.

The decision was applied first in Jordan. During their recent visit to Jordan, PLO Executive Committee Member Yasir 'Abd-Rabbuh and PLO Official Spokesman Ahmad 'Abd-al-Rahman stayed at the house of al-Tayyib 'Abd-al-Rahim, Palestine's ambassador in Amman. Palestinian sources say the decision aims at cutting travel expenses in the PLO's budget.

PLO Opens 6 Offices in Territories

TA2209152793 Tel Aviv YEDI'OT AHARONOT in Hebrew 22 Sep 93 p 6

[Report by Roni Shaqed]

[Text] Over the past two days, the PLO opened six official offices in the territories.

The main PLO office in the territories will be located in Jericho at this stage and will be inaugurated over the weekend after the Tunis leadership appoints a director for it.

So far, offices were opened in Ramallah, headed by Husayn al-Shaykh; in Qalqilyah, headed by Ahmad Shiram; in Nabulus, headed by 'Isam Abu-Bakr; in Janin, headed by Ziyad Hab-al-Rih; and an additional office was opened in Jerusalem.

Palestinian flags were yesterday hoisted on top of the buildings where the offices are located, and large signs which are to be placed above the entrance to the offices have been ordered.

Husayn al-Shaykh has said that the offices will serve the PLO and will first work in coordination with the Tunis headquarters. The first duty of the offices will be to draft policemen and expand the circle of peace supporters by explanatory means.

Egyptian Guards in Tunis To Boost Security

NC2209122493 Paris AFP in English 1205 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] Tunis, Sept 22 (AFP)—Egyptian bodyguards have been enrolled to help protect PLO chief Yasir 'Arafat, the target of death threats from Palestinian radicals, a reliable source said here Wednesday [22 September].

He said the 15 guards were already in Tunis, headquarters of the Palestine Liberation Organisation, to help boost security for 'Arafat.

Radical Palestinian factions have issued death threats against 'Arafat over the PLO-Israel autonomy accord that was signed last week, charging the agreement was a sell-out.

The PLO chairman's protection was previously restricted to hand-picked Palestinians working "in close cooperation" with Tunisian authorities, the source said.

The arrival of foreign guards has triggered "indignation" in Palestinian ranks, the source added, declining to be named.

The PLO leader embarked Tuesday on an Asian tour, starting in Beijing, but the Egyptian bodyguards are not believed to have taken up their new duties yet.

Fatah: Hamas Not Involved in Attorney's Death

JN2209153293 Paris Radio Monte Carlo in Arabic 1200 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Telephone interview with Abu-'Ali Shahin, Fatah official and head of the Intifadah in the Gaza Strip, by Ahmad Birru; date not given—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Birru] Abu-'Ali Shahin, lawyer Muhammad Abu-Sha'ban, a Fatah cadre, was assassinated in Gaza yesterday by unidentified masked persons. Do you know

anything about the party that carried out the operation, since there is an agreement between Fatah and Hamas to avoid resorting to violence?

[Shahin] First of all, one must say that the agreement that we signed with the brothers in the Hamas Movement is against the backdrop of the Palestinian democratic dialogue and atmosphere. We very much affirm that the brothers in the Hamas Movement have nothing to do with this cowardly act. However, the other party, which does not want this Palestinian national march to continue, even with something that is less than national unity, is the one that opened fire, using a silencer, in order to not only kill the brother martyr hero Muhammad Hashim Abu-Sha'ban but also assassinate the march of national unity in the Gaza Strip. [passage omitted]

We do not accuse any of our brothers in the Palestinian arena. We always level accusations against the other party, or the other side, which can never be Palestinian. Our brothers in Hamas have confirmed this to us. They have affirmed they are committed to democratic dialogue and are against such a course.

[Birru] How are you going to tackle such operations after the implementation of the autonomy agreement in Gaza and Jericho?

[Shahin] We are aware that we are not working in a void. We also are aware that our work is difficult and arduous and that our struggle in the forthcoming stage will be one of the most difficult we have faced since our movement was launched in 1965. From the premise of our confidence in our people in the occupied territories, the reply will be based on this confidence, in our confidence in national unity and in the confidence in the brothers with whom we have differences of opinion, differences of opinion that in the end serve the realization of the major national objective.

Hamas Condemns Abu-Sha'ban Murder

NC2209115993 Paris AFP in English 1131 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] Amman, Sept 22 (AFP)—The Islamic Resistance Movement (Hamas), an opponent of the PLO-Israel autonomy agreement, condemned on Wednesday [22 September] the murder in the Israeli-occupied Gaza Strip of a leading Palestinian supporter of the accord.

Hamas, which is active in the strip, said in a statement released here that it "strongly condemns political assassinations...and rejects confrontation between the sons of our people, whatever their political differences."

The assassination of Muhammad Abu-Sha'ban, 36, an activist in Yasir 'Arafat's Fatah faction of the Palestine Liberation Organisation, could have been the work of Israeli agents, it hinted.

Hamas warned Palestinians to be on the look-out for "attempts by the intelligence services and agents of the Zionist enemy to exploit the current situation and trigger fighting" between Palestinians.

Abu-Sha'ban, a moderate Palestinian lawyer, was gunned down by masked assassins in Gaza City on Tuesday as he drove home from a meeting in support of the autonomy deal, Palestinian sources said.

He was the first Palestinian to be assassinated in Gaza since the beginning of the year, when another moderate PLO activist, 'Ali Abu- Shubak, was murdered.

It was also the first murder since the PLO and Israel inked the historic accord in Washington on September 13 that has been rejected by Hamas and other radical Palestinian groups.

Fatah also issued a statement denouncing the killing. "There are groups behind this assassination who want to create a conflict in the heart of the Palestinian people in the Gaza Strip," it said.

In the wake of the accord, radical Palestinians threatened to kill 'Arafat, but Fatah said last week it had concluded a deal with Hamas, its biggest rival in the Gaza Strip, to ensure there would be no infighting.

However, Hamas denied it had signed such a deal.

Palestinian officials said Sha'ban had been sacked six weeks ago as head of Fatah's political committee in the Gaza Strip on orders from PLO headquarters in Tunis, although the reasons for his dismissal were unknown.

'Internecine Feud' Within Fatah Denied

NC2309000993 Paris AFP in English 0155 GMT 23 Sep 93

[By Barry Parker]

[Text] Gaza City, Occupied Gaza Strip, Sept 23 (AFP)—Palestinian leaders swept aside fears that the murder of a prominent PLO lawyer would ignite a bloodbath with a series of rallying cries to unite against internal and external threats.

"We are facing a test," Farouk Abu-Middayn, a member of the Palestinian delegation said at Wednesday's [22 September] highly-charged funeral of the lawyer. "Are we capable of building a state or not?" he asked.

"We must unite to tackle the challenges ahead...seize this chance to close ranks," said Abu-Middayn.

He urged Palestinians to ignore Israeli press reports that an internecine feud within Fatah, the main PLO group, led to the shooting dead Tuesday night of 36-year-old activist Muhammad Abu- Sha'ban.

The unity theme was taken up by speaker after speaker at the Islamic cemetery on the edge of the Gaza Strip after thousands of mourners joined a tumultuous cortege through the strike-bound city.

The Islamic Resistance Movement [Hamas], a bitter opponent of the PLO autonomy deal, and other fundamentalist groups sent representatives to the burial to condemn the killing of a moderate who strongly backed the peace deal.

The Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, which is also against the agreement with Israel to launch autonomy in Gaza and Jericho on October 13, also spoke out against the first assassination since the accord was sealed on September 13.

Ibrahim al-Azuri, a senior Hamas figure in Gaza, told AFP: "This is not the start of a bloodbath. We are intelligent enough to realize that this can only help the enemies of the Palestinian people."

Hamas, which has pledged to pursue the armed struggle against Israeli occupation, had no idea about who gunned down Abu-Sha'ban, he added. All Palestinian factions should meet to plot a course for the future, al-Azuri said.

The organization issued a communique pointing a finger at collaborators with the Israelis and denouncing "political assassinations and the spread of terror and fear among the people."

Accusations that Israelis were behind the killing were voiced by several speakers at the funeral. Youth in the cortege also chanted "Your killers are collaborators."

Since the historic peace breakthrough, both the PLO and Hamas have sought to play down fears of bloody clashes on the strip where the two rivals fought street battles a year ago.

Hamas militants broke up a PLO rally in Gaza two weeks ago but since then an undeclared truce seems to be holding. The fundamentalists, while denying reports of an agreement with Fatah have given a commitment not to attack fellow Palestinians unless they are collaborators.

Palestine Liberation Organization chairman Yasir 'Arafat, who can ill-afford to see his deal turn Gaza into a new Wild West, demanded a full inquiry to catch the killers. Diyab al-Lawh, head of the PLO's high political committee in Gaza, told AFP.

He said no one knew who carried out the shooting but ruled out rivalry within Fatah.

Abu-Sha'ban was legal adviser to the committee and just three days ago appointed legal adviser at the Gaza offices of the Palestinian delegation to the peace talks.

The Fatah leadership in Gaza announced in a communique that the investigation was underway and soon expected to be wrapped up. "The conclusions will be sent to Tunis which will judge what action should be taken.

"Plotters and the embittered are sowing confusion and trouble ... at this sensitive and crucial period," the communique said.

"The assassins will pay, they will be punished," it warned, urging all factions to "close ranks and set aside differences which could split national unity."

Editorial Deplores Death of Abu-Sha'ban

NC2309104693 Jerusalem AL-NAHAR in Arabic 22 Sep 93 pp 3, 7

[Editorial: "Liquidation Is Utterly Unacceptable"]

[Excerpts] Yesterday, the Gaza Strip lost one of its patriotic men, murdered by unknown assailants. The news shook the conscience of the Palestinian people. The Palestinian people and leaders, from across the political spectrum, had warned against such unpatriotic and inhumane methods that could only disrupt a national unity that we have managed to preserve despite the past 26 years of occupation. [passage omitted]

Lawyer Muhammad Abu-Sha'ban, a loyal son of Gaza whose bright mind shone like a candle on a moonless night, is dead. His death was sudden and its suddenness dreadful. Yes, we all will die. But when some suspect individuals snuff out the life of one of our most promising young men, their deed leaves us with shattered hopes, revived fears, and a prayer that God may spare us the woes of infighting. [passage omitted]

Dissidents and power seekers who believe that the assassination of Abu-Hazim [Abu-Sha'ban] would turn back the clock must understand that our national unity is strong as a rock, one on which all attempts to harm our people and their cause have foundered. Our people will remain faithful to their mission and loyal to their goals.

Let us conclude by quoting this passage from the Koran: "Think not of those who are slain in God's day as dead. Nay, they live, finding their sustenance in the presence of their Lord."

Fatah, Hamas Aides Differ on Existence of Pact

PM2209171593 London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT in Arabic 18 Sep 93 p 3

[Muhammad 'Ali al-Qulaybi and Salwa al-Ustuwani reports: "Statements and Counterstatements by Hamas and Fatah"]

[Excerpt] Tunis, Damascus, Amman, Gaza, agencies—Muhammad Ghunaym (Abu-Mahir), Fatah Central Committee member in charge of mobilization and organization, has stated that there is a field agreement between Fatah and Hamas to avoid any clashes between them over the peace steps.

In a statement to AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT, he said that the field agreement was reached between the youth of each movement on the eve of the Palestinian-Israeli agreement signing in Washington to prevent any clashes that would harm the Palestinians as a whole.

Abu-Mahir said the agreement is important and we in Fatah regard it as a positive step that paves the way for a larger and more comprehensive reconciliation and also paves the way for the start of talks at the meeting expected to be held between the two movements in Sanaa.

Abu-Mahir's statement comes after a number of statements and counterstatements, some confirming and others denying the existence of an agreement, and some others neither confirming nor denying it.

Hamas official spokesman Engineer Ibrahim Ghawshah has cast some doubt on the statement issued by Fatah in Tunis and speaking of a new Fatah-Hamas agreement

rejecting recourse to violence and use of arms over the Palestinian-Israeli agreement.

In an exclusive statement to AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT, he said that he was inclined to go along with the denial issued by Hamas Representative in Jordan Muhammad Nazzal regarding that statement. He noted that 'Arafat resorts to such methods every time he wrongs the Palestinian people's cause and he tries to give the impression that there has been some kind of rapprochement between Hamas and Fatah, exploiting Hamas's name and credibility in Palestinian, Arab, and Islamic circles to absorb popular anger and resentment. [passage omitted]

Paper Gives Further Details on Latest Intifadah 'Call'

JN2209120093 Amman AL-RA'Y in Arabic 22 Sep 93 p 40

[By 'Awdah 'Awdah]

[Text] It appears the Palestinian-Israeli agreement is accompanied by radical changes on the ground in the occupied Arab territories.

At the beginning of every month, a call is issued by the United National Leadership of the Intifadah [UNLI], which comprises four Palestinian factions: Fatah, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine [PFLP], the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine [DFLP], and the Palestinian People's Party [PPP]. Up until now, the UNLI's call No. 98 has not been issued. Instead a call signed by the National Leadership of the Intifadah [NLI] was issued by the PFLP and DFLP.

A participant in a meeting held in Damascus told AL-RA'Y that Fatah and the PPP refused to issue intifadah call No. 98, and the leaderships of PFLP and DFLP were forced to issue a call which was signed by the National Leadership of the Intifadah, the NLI.

He said the two fronts asked the Arab Liberation Front to participate in NLI activities providing it commits itself to the national Palestinian program approved by the previous sessions of the Palestine National Council, the intifadah's national program, and the program of defending the Palestinian people's right to self- determination, right to return [to Palestine], and right to an independent state, in addition to rejecting the recent Palestinian- Israeli agreement signed in Washington.

The NLI call No. 98 called for avoiding internal friction and fighting, and directing such activities against the occupation forces and settlers in order to avoid attempts to sow discord and derail our people's struggle, and in order to preserve the sanctity of the Palestinian flag, which should not be hoisted under the protection of the occupation forces but only during confrontations with these forces. The call urged for continuing and escalating the intifadah activities to restore our people's national rights, topped by their right to return, self-determination, and establishment of the independent state whose capital is holy Jerusalem. The call also called for organizing visits to the martyrs tombs and renewing the pledge to continue their march and remain loyal to the objectives for which they sacrificed their souls. The call also called for avoiding all steps toward normalization of relations with the occupation forces as long as the occupation of our land continues.

The NLI emphasized that holy Jerusalem is an inseparable part of the occupied Palestinian territories.

'Arafat Asks People To Support Agreement With Israel

LD2209190193 Algiers Voice of Palestine in Arabic 1702 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] The brother Abu-'Ammar [Yasir 'Arafat], president of the state of Palestine, chairman of the PLO Executive Committee, gave the following statement to WAFA:

The establishment of a permanent, comprehensive and just peace is the fundamental goal we all endeavor to achieve. The Palestinian-Israeli agreement made recently—as our Arab brothers considered it to be a first, important step on the road to the sought-after solution—the PLO, in its capacity as the legitimate and sole representative of the Palestinian people, is worthy of the credibility of adherence to what it agrees on. It calls on its great people to participate in the measures which will lead to the return of normal life and the rejection of violence and terrorism, to contribute toward achieving peace and stability, to participate actively in constructive work and economic development, and to cooperate in a way which embodies the adherence of the Israeli side to this agreement.

The Israeli withdrawal from Gaza and Jericho, and the establishment of our national authority in both in accordance with the decisions of our national councils, and on the road toward ending the occupation, is the practical beginning for the establishment of our independent Palestinian state on our national soil, which must necessarily be the firm pillar of a just and comprehensive peace in our region, and also for moving toward progress and prosperity.

At this time, I feel deep sadness for the martyrdom of the great struggler, the lawyer Muhammad Abu-Sha'ban, adviser to the Palestinian delegation in Gaza. I mourn the death of this brave leader who devoted his life to the service of his cause, people, homeland, and the Fatah Movement.

PLO's 'Abbas on Agreements, Peace Process

PM2209090993 London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT in Arabic 17 Sep 93 p 5

[Interview with PLO Executive Committee Member Mahmud 'Abbas, alias Abu-Mazin, by Muhammad 'Ali al-Qulaybi in Tunis; date not given]

[Excerpts] [Al-Qulaybi] How would you assess the results of the talks and contacts conducted in Washington with U.S. President Bill Clinton, Congress members, and Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhaq Rabin?

['Abbas] Apart from the agreement and achievement, about which we talked a lot, what happened in Washington also attracted attention, especially with regard to the U.S. Administration's position toward the PLO and its desire not only to hold a dialogue and contacts with the PLO, but also to remove all the legislative obstacles in Congress imposing certain restrictions on the U.S. Administration vis-a-vis its dealings with us.

We also noted the U.S. Administration's wish to continue to sponsor the peace process and the Palestinian-Israeli track. It also strongly announced through President Clinton that it would not allow this agreement to fail.

The final point is that the U.S. Government showed enthusiasm for amassing international economic aid to build a real economy in the occupied territory. [passage omitted]

[Al-Qulaybi] When do you expect the U.S. Congress to remove legislative obstacles concerning dealings with the PLO?

['Abbas] They told us that the U.S. Administration would present its ideas and views about this issue to the U.S. Congress, but it could take some time.

[Al-Qulaybi] But the direct dialogue between the U.S. Administration and the PLO has now resumed.

['Abbas] President Clinton announced before our arrival in Washington that he had decided to resume the dialogue and contacts with the PLO. In fact this is not enough: The relationship must be more comprehensive than dialogue and contacts—which requires a decision from Congress.

[Al-Qulaybi] During your talks with the U.S. President and Congress officials did you receive tangible promises and assurances?

['Abbas] There is talk that contains a lot of warmth and sincerity. But to ensure it is true, we need to see it on the ground. So it is time that will determine whether or not what we were told is going to be implemented.

[Al-Qulaybi] What were you told?

['Abbas] We [the Americans] are willing to provide economic aid to the occupied territory and to urge others to provide similar aid in order to enable the occupied territory to develop its economy and reach the neighboring states' level. [passage omitted]

[Al-Qulaybi] Can it be said that the communications are now open between Israel and the PLO?

['Abbas] Contacts are now open. We have agreed that there should be a liaison officer between us and them in order to implement the agreement. There is more than one committee that should meet, like the committee for the transfer of authority, the election committee, and the committee for arranging the Palestinian leadership's and police's entry to Gaza and Jericho. These questions should be arranged and agreed. This is why we agreed to have a liaison officer in order to exchange views and form these committees.

[Al-Qulaybi] What form will Palestinian-Israeli negotiations take after the signing of the agreement?

['Abbas] The negotiations in the next stage will be in the form of committees. There will be more than one committee in more than one place in order to work to implement the agreement. There could be a committee in Washington, a committee in Europe, and a committee in the Arab homeland; in Egypt, for example.

[Al-Qulaybi] And in Israel?

['Abbas] We did not discuss that issue. I did not rule out a committee in Israel. Why? Because the committees will be mixed, with members from inside and outside [the occupied territories], thus it is premature to meet now inside the occupied territories, whether in Israel or on our territory. [passage omitted]

[Al-Qulaybi] Will there be a political committee at foreign minister level?

['Abbas] That is premature, because what we need now is not a political committee, but rather a committee to implement geographical jurisdiction, the transfer of authority, the holding of the elections, or the entry to Gaza and Jericho. We also need a committee to clarify the crossing points question and agree on it. All these questions require agreements before we can talk about them politically.

[Al-Qulaybi] What arrangements have been made for the process of transferring authority in Gaza, Jericho, and the other occupied territories, and how and when will it be conducted?

['Abbas] First, I believe that no favor has been done to the agreement by calling it "Gaza-Jericho First," as though the question concerns Gaza and Jericho only. It concerns all the West Bank and Gaza. And powers—or most powers—will be transferred once the Israeli Army withdraws. Some powers will also be transferred in the other parts of the West Bank before the elections are held. Then all powers agreed upon would be transferred. So there is no difference between the work to be conducted in Gaza and Jericho and that to be conducted in the other parts of the West Bank. There is nothing more to it than: There will be a withdrawal, hence there will be leaderships in these areas. There will also be a transfer of authority and redeployment of the forces and their departure from inhabited areas to known and specific areas. The redeployment of these forces will take place on the eve of the elections. So the withdrawal from Gaza and Jericho will take place within seven months from now. And the forces' redeployment from all the West Bank and Gaza will take place within nine months from now, in the sense that in nine months there will be no Israeli Army in any Palestinian city or village. This is mentioned in the agreement, which we have officially distributed and published through WAFA because it was said that there were secret appendices. These appendices were published, but anyone with an iota of reason who reads them will realize instantly that they are false and untrue. This is why we published what we have and hid nothing at all. [passage omitted]

[Al-Qulaybi] Do you believe that after the signing of the Palestinian-Israeli agreement in Washington the time has come for Arab-Israeli relations to be normalized?

['Abbas] I do not believe that that should be done before we see the Palestinian-Israeli agreement implemented and before the other Arab tracks—the Syrian-Israeli track and the Lebanese-Israeli track—have been completed. Obviously the Jordanian-Israeli track has been initialed, but something final is also needed on the Jordanian track. We are not asking the Arabs to normalize their relations with Israel before a comprehensive peace agreement with all the Arab states is reached. [passage omitted]

[Al-Qulaybi] After the signing of the agreement, what will the fate of the intifadah be? Is it true that you promised Israel to end it?

['Abbas] Let us ask why the intifadah was launched. The intifadah was launched to fight the Israeli occupation—a legitimate right that our people have exercised over six years. It is a legitimate right for all the peoples of the world to fight occupation by whatever means they deem suitable. So who are you going to fight when the occupation departs? So some actions might continue as long as there is an occupation. But when the occupation departs, the Palestinian people are not fans of rising up. They are compelled to rise up. So the PLO was set up for the sake of achieving these aims and it will stay for the sake of achieving these aims.

[Al-Qulaybi] And after these aims have been achieved?

['Abbas] After five or four years, God willing, and after everything has been resolved, including the refugee problem, the Jerusalem problem, and the other problems, the PLO would turn into a Palestinian state.... We have not abandoned the option of establishing an independent Palestinian state. Nor have we abandoned the option of establishing a confederation with Jordan, regardless of what has been said and rumored about the Palestinians wanting to go it alone. We do not want to proceed alone. We need our brothers, and we will continue to need one another. What we said in the past about a confederation will continue to exist, because it is in the interests of not only us but our brothers in Jordan, as well. [passage omitted]

[Al-Qulaybi] When will the Palestinian leadership return to Gaza and Jericho?

['Abbas] I believe that it should return when the Israeli withdrawal from the Gaza Strip and Jericho has been completed.

[Al-Qulaybi] 'Arafat's, Rabin's, Abu-Mazin's, and Peres' speeches in Washington reflected verbal conflict over Jerusalem. Has each party got its own Jerusalem, or what exactly?

['Abbas] We accept nothing but that they have their own Jerusalem and we have ours. I said this over seven years ago. Some people criticized me for it. I say it once again now: They have their own Jerusalem, and we have ours. Holy Jerusalem is East Jerusalem. The Jerusalem that was occupied in 1967 is to us an occupied Arab territory like any other territory occupied in 1967. Thus when it returns to us, it will be the Palestinian state's capital. That is with regard to us. How they think, how they interpret and look at matters, that is their business. This is why Jerusalem has been included on the agenda of the final phase.

[Al-Qulaybi] Are the historic Palestinian figures we see on the political stage the ones who will lead the Palestinian people in the transitional phase in Gaza and Jericho?

['Abbas] I believe that the people of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip must assume or effectively participate in transitional authority. But they might not dispense with some of the symbols present abroad. I say it more openly: Abu-'Ammar [Yasir 'Arafat] is essential for the stage, and he should be there as a symbol for the Palestinian people. But he is bound to need the capabilities available inside [the occupied territories] to lead with him.... He might not dispense with all those abroad, but he should take account of the people inside in terms of running Palestinian authority in the next two years.

[Al-Qulaybi] Are you at this stage thinking about the national building process, that is, accommodating and including the opposition?

['Abbas] For our part, we are seeking and calling for a national dialogue with the opposition. We have heard that Hamas has called for this dialogue. We feel happy about this call, and we invite them not only to a dialogue, but to participate in power in the future and to continue in the opposition and enter the elections and succeed in them. If they win power, they are welcome. If they do not, they can participate through their opposition to those who win a majority. But this opposition should be positive, not negative, that is, democratic, not repressive. [passage omitted]

Egypt

Al-Asad, Mubarak Discuss Arab Developments

Hold Expanded Meeting 22 Sep

JN2209162193 Damascus Syrian Arab Republic Radio Network in Arabic 1515 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] President Hafiz al-Asad and Egyptian President Muhammad Husni Mubarak held a closed session of talks at Ra's al-Tin Palace in Alexandria. Meanwhile, a meeting was held between the Syrian and Egyptian sides. Attending on the Syrian side were Foreign Minister Faruq al-Shar', Interior Minister Dr. Muhammad Harbah, and Syria's Ambassador in Cairo Dr. 'Isa Darwish. Attending on the Egyptian side were Dr. 'Atif Sidqi, the prime minister; eng. Sulayman Mitawalli, the minister of communications; General Husayn Tantawi, the minister of defense; Safwat al-Sharif, the minister of information; Major General Hasan al-Alfi, the minister of the interior; Dr. Usamah al-Baz, the first under secretary of the Foreign Ministry and director of the president's office for political affairs; and Dr. Mustafa 'Abd-al-'Aziz Mursi, Egypt's ambassador in Damascus.

The two presidents held an expanded meeting at 1515 today. Attending the meeting on the Syrian side were Foreign Minister Faruq al-Shar', Interior Minister Dr. Muhammad Harbah, and Syria's Ambassador in Cairo Dr. 'Isa Darwish. Attending on the Egyptian side were Dr. 'Atif Sidqi, the prime minister; eng. Sulayman Mitawalli, the minister of communications; General Husayn Tantawi, the minister of defense; Safwat al-Sharif, the minister of information; Major General Hasan al-Alfi, the minister of the interior; Dr. Usamah al-Baz, the first under secretary of the Foreign Ministry and director of the president's office for political affairs; and Dr. Mustafa 'Abd-al-'Aziz Mursi, Egypt's ambassador in Damascus.

Discussion dealt with developments in the Arab arena, the situation in the region, the peace process, and issues of common interest.

Al-Asad Honored at Banquet

JN2209164493 Damascus SANA in Arabic 1525 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] Cairo, 22 Sep (SANA)—Egyptian President Muhammad Husni Mubarak held a luncheon banquet in honor of President Hafiz al-Asad today. The banquet was attended by members of the delegation accompanying the president. It was also attended by Egyptian Prime Minister Dr. 'Atif Sidqi, ministers, the Alexandria governor, senior Army and police officers, Syria's ambassador in Cairo, and Egypt's ambassador in Damascus.

Mubarak, Al-Asad Hold News Conference

NC2209161993 Cairo ESC Television in Arabic 1500 GMT 22 Sep 93

[News conference by President Husni Mubarak and Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad with foreign and domestic correspondents at the Ra's al-Tin Palace in Alexandria on 22 September; portions of new conference in quotation marks conducted in English—recorded]

[Text] [Mubarak] Naturally, I welcome my brother President Hafiz al-Asad. The consultations between Egypt and Syria are continuous, and we are used to them, which is natural. In our consultations and exchanges of views, we discuss various issues, including peace. We have discussed all these points as well as the consequences of the agreement concluded between Israel and the Palestinians, the PLO. We have also discussed the peace issue in general, particularly with regard to finding a solution with Syria, God willing.

[Correspondent] President Mubarak...

[Mubarak, interrupting] Hold on a minute; why are you in a hurry? Any questions?

[Correspondent] Did your talks today with His Excellency President al-Asad introduce any new elements to the Arab position, so activating the peace process and pushing it toward its prescribed goal, namely, a just and comprehensive peace?

[Mubarak] We and Syria are working to boost the peace issue so that we can achieve a just and comprehensive peace. As for the elements, if there were any, we could not say what they were before the media. All our goals aim to proceed with the peace march until we regain the just Arab right.

[WASHINGTON POST correspondent Carol Murphy] "President al-Asad: Have you been privately assured yet, or are you convinced that as part of any peaceful accord with Israel that they are committed already to full withdrawal from the Golan. We all know this is what you want, but I am asking are you convinced of that, or have you been privately assured of it?

[Mubarak] "The voice is not so clear; could you do it without the microphone please?

[Murphy] "We all know that as part of a peace [word indistinct] with Israel, we know what you want: Full withdrawal from the Golan. My question is are you already convinced that, or have you been already assured, that Israel is prepared to do that as part of a peaceful accord in the future?"

[Al-Asad] Until the last round of talks, there was no progress on the occupied Syrian territories. A Syrian paper is being discussed or one that was submitted for discussion in the previous rounds. It is a document of principles. No agreement has been reached on it, including no agreement on the issue of full withdrawal.

[Correspondent] President al-Asad: You have described the Israeli-Palestinian agreement as a painful surprise from which the Arabs stand to lose. What are the shortcomings of this agreement from the Syrian viewpoint and what [words indistinct]?

[Mubarak] You are from REUTER, right? Do you always cause problems?

[Al-Asad] If I were to answer you it would take a long lecture that would last several hours, more than we needed for my discussion or press interview [reference to al-Asad's interview with AL-AKHBAR on 20 September].

First, we were pained because the Arab sides were moving consistently, coordinating their efforts. The opening of this gap in the Arab wall was not in the interest of the Arabs, including the Palestinian brothers. As I said, no matter what struggle each individual Arab party puts up, it will be weaker and less powerful than the collective Arab group. This is what causes annoyance, especially since the other parties did not know about the thing that took place.

As I also said in the statement you are referring to, I hope that the agreement will be able to give the Palestinian brothers what they deserve. But if you want me to enumerate the agreement's loopholes, I may as well refer you to the agreement and ask you to read it carefully. Then you will not need to ask me, although I believe you must have read it. As you know, the agreement is several pages long and one is left with the impression that each point or idea in the agreement needs another agreement, and that the other agreement needs negotiations.

[Correspondent] Mr. President, first you said that Israel was the only winner. How do you explain this? Why did you say that? Second, what do you say to the argument that Israel is dragging each Arab party into a separate deal?

[Al-Asad] If Israel cannot work except on individual tracks, then those who worked for the peace process and participated in it should not work for it or participate in it. We participated collectively: all the Arab sides and Israel. Since we participated in such a collective way, the process is supposed to be collective. In addition, peace involves UN resolutions and rules of justice. This cannot be achieved by singling out the Arab parties.

As to why Israel won, it is because we lost. We lost because Arab coordination was somewhat affected by what has taken place. One of us has left the group.

[Mubarak] "I would like to add something here. All the countries in the area are looking for real and fair peace. I differ with Mr. Rabin on the point that he could go only on one track. It is difficult. One track is not enough to reach a comprehensive settlement because as far as [word indistinct] signed this declaration of principles, it is the beginning of the problems. Still a long, complicated way to achieve or to reach a solution for the Palestinian problem. We cannot put aside the Syrian track until you go through that. That is why I think backening [word as heard] the direction of Syria is so important in this specific period of time."

[Correspondent] President Husni Mubarak, do you believe that the Gaza-Jericho agreement [words indistinct]?

[Mubarak] Look, I want to tell you something. The Gaza-Jericho agreement is not a final one but a start. It might have created problems in that it was a surprise for some brothers. There was coordination with some brothers. We had an idea, but we did not know anything at all about what went on in the secret talks. We learned when the secret talks began and even learned later that they had started about six months before the date we knew about. Whether this is correct or not, we did not know the details of what went on during the secret talks until we learned that they had initialed [the agreement] in Oslo. We knew about it during the night. I, in fact, did not know. But if we are asked to help, we will do so.

Are there problems? Of course. There is coordination between the PLO, Syria, and Jordan. Therefore, when Abu-'Ammar [Yasir 'Arafat] came here, I asked him when we heard about the signing: Does President al-Asad know about this? It became clear to me that President al-Asad was not in the picture. Therefore, I contacted my brother President Hafiz so that Abu-'Ammar could go there. He travelled there four or five days later and put him in the picture. This created a problem, there is no doubt. If one pulls ahead of the others in the solution, the problems will get aggravated.

[Correspondent] [Words indistinct]?

[Al-Asad] Washington and Russia are cosponsoring the peace process. This process was basically established on the U.S. initiative, which is, in turn, based on the Security Council resolutions. Consequently, Washington is active in accordance with the responsibility bestowed on it by the initiative it had made to achieve peace in the region. This is what the United States is doing so far.

[Mubarak] "One more question."

[Correspondent] [Words indistinct]?

[Mubarak] "Look. Both sides understand what I mean by the word flexibility. But I am not going to tackle it through the media. Thank you very much."

Further on News Conference

NC2209174393 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1440 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Excerpts] Alexandria, 22 Sep (MENA)—President Husni Mubarak has said that for a lasting and just peace to be achieved in the region the Golan must be returned to Syria. A solution to the Golan problem is now very important, he told a news conference after his talks with Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad today. [passage omitted]

Asked about the Arab boycott of Israel and whether Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhaq Rabin has recently discussed this issue with him, President Mubarak said: Rabin did not discuss the boycott. The boycott was initiated by an Arab League resolution and can be changed only by an Arab League resolution.

Asked whether his recent talks with Rabin and his talks with al-Asad today produced results toward a solution to the Syrian-Israeli problem, President Mubarak said: All that I can say is that we hope that the Syrian question will be solved before the end of this year.

President Mubarak was asked about Rabin's recent statements on the Golan. He replied: Sometimes, some strong

statements are needed for local consumption. Nothing happens if I make hardline statements at the same time I am concluding agreements.

Asked if the Washington peace talks have come to a halt, President Mubarak said: I have no information that the talks have stopped. I am sure that the talks will be resumed in the near future.

Asked whether Israel intends to cut off some of the Golan territory, President Mubarak said: I cannot say that Israel said this or did not say that. You can ask Mr. Rabin. But I can say that for a comprehensive settlement and peace to be achieved, the Golan must return to Syria. This is my conviction and I have repeatedly said it before.

The president added: I did not hear that Israel will take part of the Golan. Rabin did not say this to me. But I stress that without the return of the Golan to Syria, the problem will not end.

President al-Asad was asked whether the Israeli-Palestinian agreement will affect Syria's position toward peace. He replied: Syria sticks to the peace process, and the agreement will not affect Syria's position toward the process. We will continue the peace process to the end. We want to establish a just and comprehensive peace in the region. When I say just and comprehensive I mean that we, and others, have a certain perception of what the words mean. These things are being discussed at the negotiating table in Washington.

President al-Asad added: At any rate, we followed, adhered to, and are still adhering to the peace process, and we know that this requires movement in two directions, not one.

He added: I would also like to emphasize our view that the Palestinian-Israeli agreement does not negatively affect Syria's rights. We are not discussing the agreement in terms of its impact on Syrian interests. Syria's interests remain as they are, whether we are in a group of four, five, or one.

He said that Syria has a clear vision and a firm position toward its rights and the entire peace process. We believe that this vision is in the interests of all peoples, Arab and non-Arab, he said.

Asked what advice he would like to give to all sides, President Mubarak said: There is no advice, the issue is clear: A just and comprehensive peace and each party must get his rights.

Asked about the deadlock on the Syrian-Israeli track, Mubarak said: There is no deadlock, as some people understand. The 11th round of talks in Washington ended a short time ago, and the parties will agree on a new round. I believe that some progress on the Syrian track must be made in the next round because the Syrian track is important for the entire peace process.

President Mubarak expressed hope that there will be flexibility in the next round of talks so a settlement can be reached on the Golan Heights, as this is a very important issue for Syria.

All our contacts with the United States and Israel fall within this framework, and we believe that the Syrian track is very important for the peace process and for us, Mubarak said.

The president added: The Palestine problem has continued for many years, but I believe that the Syrian problem can be solved easily.

Asked what he wants Washington to do to get the peace process moving, President al-Asad said: The United States and Russia are sponsoring the peace process. The process was basically launched on the basis of the U.S. plan, which, in turn, is based on the Security Council resolutions. The activity of the peace process, therefore, depends on what the U.S. Administration arranges for peace. This is what the United States can do.

Asked about the kind of flexibility he is calling for, President Mubarak said: Each party understands what I mean. I will not discuss this through the media.

Al-Asad Departs 22 Sep

NC2209173193 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1615 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Excerpt] Alexandria, 22 Sep (MENA)—Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad left Alexandria this evening after a short visit during which he held talks with President Husni Mubarak. [passage omitted]

Mubarak Discusses Peace Moves With AL-MUSAWWAR

NC2209123393 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1110 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] Cairo, 22 Sep (MENA)—President Husni Mubarak has stated the importance of reaching a fair agreement between Syria and Israel, noting that the circumstances are now ripe for making progress on the Syrian-Israeli track, especially after the Palestinian-Israeli agreement. In an interview with Friday's [17 September's] edition of the magazine AL-MUSAWWAR, President Mubarak said there are signs of Israeli readiness to withdraw from the Golan within the framework of a four-month timetable as well as acceptance of a gradual solution for the settlements. Israel accepts the deployment of multinational forces in which the United States will participate on both sides.

President Mubarak said there are signs both parties are on the verge of an agreement on a new formula to accommodate issues relating to normalizing relations between the two countries.

Asked whether Egyptian-Israeli relations may warm given the progress in the peace talks, President Mubarak said: We are open to normal ties with Israel based on even-handed cooperation and not governed by past complexes, because we are self-confident and fear nothing. He said he believed the Palestinian-Israeli agreement and the expected Israeli-Syrian agreement will open the door for firm peaceful relations among the region's peoples.

In his statements to AL-MUSAWWAR's Chief Editor Makram Muhammad Ahmad, President Mubarak called on the Arab countries to assert their solidarity and cooperation and realize that further cooperation with Egypt is the best guarantee for the future. He stressed his confidence that no one can take Egypt's role or underestimate its standing. He expressed the belief that we are pressing ahead on the path to restoring Arab solidarity despite some difficulties. He said the situation is now better, noting the growing acceptance of reestablishing ties with the PLO, Yemen, and Jordan. He noted that things remain difficult regarding Iraq as long as Saddam Husayn is in power. The issue will need more time "because we cannot ask those whose country was occupied to forget what happened." He expressed his belief that there is no contradiction between the Arab market and the Middle East market and that "the whole issue hinges on our ability to achieve common coordination and a more effective Arab position through the Arab League, which will continue to play its pan-Arab role."

Asked about Sudan's request for Egypt's help to convince the United States that Sudan does not sponsor terrorism, President Mubarak said Sudan is a neighbor and stressed that the border between the two countries is safe: Egypt watches closely to prevent terrorist groups from using the border. He noted that Egypt repeatedly asked the brothers in Sudan to look at the situation and that the atmosphere is calming down. I believe they understand our position well.

President Mubarak stressed that Egyptian-U.S. relations are good and distinguished. Some confusion and misunderstanding occurred over Shaykh 'Umar 'Abd-al-Rahman's case because of media treatment of it. That was a summer cloud, which has passed. He said there is good cooperation between Egypt and the new U.S. Administration, which well understands the region's issues and problems.

President Mubarak reviewed domestic issues, primarily the referendum to reelect him for a third term. He stressed that he is most concerned that every citizen should perform his duty and voice his opinion according to his conscience.

He added that it is not important whether the citizen says yes or no; the important thing is the practice, because democracy evolves and grows with practice.

Asked about the demand by some circles that the president should be selected through direct nomination and election, President Mubarak said direct elections might not be the ideal way to elect a president who represents the free will of the electors, because there are some people ready to spend millions to buy votes to ensure the success of a president under their control.

Mubarak emphasized that the post of president of the Republic is vital, so it should have the highest possible guarantees to ensure its integrity. He noted that various democratic states hold two-stage presidential elections through delegates or representatives who approve the nomination before it is put to the popular vote.

The president said he is not against changing the Constitution in Egypt and expressed his belief that changing the Constitution is not a high priority for Egypt right now.

He expressed fear that changing the Constitution might leave the door wide open for differences at a time when we are in dire need of cohesion.

He explained that the political scene in Egypt is made up of various conflicting trends that have been unable to reach a national accord defining their right priorities "and each party wants a Constitution that pleases."

He said constitutional change will need at least three years during which Egypt will become a fierce political battleground between heterogeneous trends and forces that lack even the slightest accord, which could affect investment in Egypt.

He said he is not afraid of amending the Constitution, but concerned for the nation's interests against those who are engaged in one-upmanship in the name of constitutional amendment.

The president said this government has, for the first time, achieved an academic, practical, and well-planned program for the measures that should govern economic reform so that Egypt can cope with it.

He added: In light of this program, I exerted extraordinary effort over numerous tours to convince heads of state of the need to stand by Egypt and agree to its demands for gradual reform. He stressed that if 'Atif Sidqi's government hadn't remained in office, the program could not have been implemented.

Mubarak said Dr. Sidqi could remain as prime minister in a government including several new ministers to implement economic reform. He noted that the criteria governing the selection of new ministers are that the person should be well qualified in his specialization, enjoy a good reputation and integrity, and be able to defend his view and convince others.

Asked about terrorism, President Mubarak asserted that the security authority hand is strong and controls the situation. He remarked that the incidents don't scare us, adding that every country suffers waves of terror, but our situation is still better than many others.

He pointed out that unemployment is one of the most important problems that he concerns himself with and seeks to solve through good relations with Arab countries, especially the Gulf states, to create jobs for the highest number of Egyptians.

President Mubarak dismissed as groundless reports about selling public sector companies. He added: We only sold a few hotels and small factories. As for the public sector's major factories, they will not be sold.

Mubarak Queried on Peace, Lockerbie, Iran

NC2309103893 Cairo MENA in Arabic 0829 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Text] Cairo, 23 Sep (MENA)—President Husni Mubarak has emphasized the importance of rational behavior so the Middle East region will remain cohesive, genuine peace will be achieved, and the land returned. He said that this requires continued consultations among the parties concerned. He welcomed any move that would lead to the establishment of just peace, the return of the land, and a solution to the Jerusalem issue. He noted that the land cannot be returned all at once or in one step.

In an interview with the [Egyptian] newspaper AL-HAYAH published today, President Mubarak warned of outside forces playing in the region and having many interests. He noted that there are forces that do not want stability or a solution, but want us to bleed continuously.

President Mubarak said that he had been aware of the secret negotiations between the PLO and Israel since March, and intervened during the last week of these negotiations. This intervention led to the convening of the Paris meeting and the agreement that was signed in Washington on 13 September.

President Mubarak said that his government is trying to help Syria reach an agreement with Israel, ensuring Israel's complete withdrawal from the Golan. He expected that something would happen on the Syrian track this year.

Asked whether Lebanon will reach an agreement with Israel before or after Syria, President Mubarak said: Perhaps together. We are interested in Lebanon just as we are interested in Egypt or Syria. The president noted that he raised some points concerning Lebanon with Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhaq Rabin.

Asked about the possibility of the Arab states establishing diplomatic relations with Israel, President Mubarak said he does not think that the circumstances of the Gulf states will allow them to embark on something like this. But, he said, he had heard about Morocco and Tunisia.

The president reaffirmed that Egyptian-U.S. relations are good, and that he constantly confers with U.S. President Bill Clinton.

President Mubarak also noted that he confers with King Fahd Bin-'Abd-al-'Aziz and Saudi officials and constantly coordinates with them not only regarding the Palestinian issue but on all issues of interest to the two countries.

The president expected a solution of the Lockerbie crisis between Libya and the West, saying there is hope that a breakthrough will take place within the next few days.

Regarding Egyptian-Sudanese relations, President Mubarak said that relations with Sudan have improved since he met with its leaders during the recent African summit conference. He noted that the terrorists who have arrived in Egypt were from Afghanistan. They were trained by Iran and sent to Egypt via Sudan and Yemen.

President Mubarak explained that Egypt does not maintain relations with Iran. He said that Iran wanted to establish relations at the ambassadorial level. But then differences broke out between the radical and moderate forces in Iran. Then they asked to establish cultural relations. He said: I found that there was some sort of a game involved, and I refused. Every party must respect the internal affairs of the other party and not interfere in them. He said that Egypt could respond the same way to any interference, but it does not do that, because this is not its style.

President Mubarak said that he decided not to go to New York on 29 September to deliver his speech at the UN General Assembly because of the referendum on his third term. He added: It is my lot to assume office in one of the most difficult times. We have accomplished a great deal, but much more remains to be done. He stressed the importance of continued development and economic reform, completing the infrastructure, and reinforcing stability.

President Mubarak said that the opposition's position that does not support his nomination was not surprising to him, because they have to say no. But the people's position is different. He said: Had they not been convinced that I am working for their good, they would not give me their support.

The president said that he experienced psychological conflict for six months, since last January, because of the renewed term and his appreciation of the difficult task he will undertake.

Sources Cited on U.S. Aid, Musa Washington Visit

NC2209205193 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1835 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] Washington, 22 Sep (MENA)—Egyptian sources here have stated that U.S. aid to Egypt and its continuation occupy a prominent place on the agenda of Foreign Minister 'Amr Musa's current visit to the U.S. capital and his talks with senior officials in the U.S. Administration.

The sources referred to the meeting the foreign minister held yesterday with USAID Administrator Brian Atwood. The sources added that the discussion touched on how to "develop" the aid that Egypt receives from the United States so it can serve Egypt's medium-and long-term interests, in view of the pressure that the U.S. Administration is coming under because of increasing demands to reduce foreign aid, particularly from Congress. The United States provides Egypt with $2.1 billion in aid annually; $1.3 billion is military aid and the rest is economic assistance.

Recent reports in the U.S. media have noted that there is a trend to make an overall change in the "concept" of U.S. external aid so that financial allocations are earmarked to achieve specific goals throughout the world, such as spreading democracy and limiting arms, instead of just extending assistance to various countries.

It has also been learned that Musa discussed with the USAID director the U.S. contribution to support the Palestinian-Israeli agreement which, according to U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher, will reach $250 million. It will be part of the international assistance that is expected to reach $3 billion over a period of 10 years.

Muslim Scholars Praise Palestinian-Israeli Accord

NC2109081993 Cairo AKHIR SA'AH in Arabic 15 Sep 93 pp 10-11

[Report by Hasan 'Allam]

[Excerpts] His Eminence Shaykh Jad-al-Haq 'Ali Jad-al-Haq, grand imam of al-Azhar, has stated: Undoubtedly, the PLO-Israeli (Gaza-Jericho) agreement is an advanced step ending the Palestinians' hesitation over the issue of conciliation or peace. [passage omitted]

Shaykh Jad-al-Haq explained the principle of peace in Islam in light of the issue of the day—the Palestinian-Israeli agreement. He said: The Koran's principle: "But if the enemy inclines toward peace, do thou also incline toward peace, and trust in God" is a general principle. Islam does not advocate war or belligerence as a basis for international relations; it advocates peace. This holy verse is a permanent title for peace between the Muslims and others. Islam encourages peace between Muslims and others and among the Muslims themselves. [passage omitted]

Addressing the Palestinians, especially the factions that oppose the agreement, Shaykh Jad-al-Haq said: They must remember history. They must remember late President Anwar al-Sadat, who prepared the road for them even though he did not speak in their name. But they did not respond. A long time would pass before they could achieve what al-Sadat prepared. [passage omitted]

Mufti Muhammad Sayyid Tantawi said: This agreement is a good step on the road toward our Palestinian brothers achieving their rights. From my viewpoint, this is a sound, good agreement that will lead to their acquiring all their remaining rights in full. Rain begins with a few drops. The road that needs a million steps begins with one step. I feel this agreement is good for the Palestinians in particular and the Arabs in general. [passage omitted]

Libya

Tripoli 'Prepared' To Hand Over Lockerbie Suspects

LD2209202893 Madrid RNE-1 Radio Network in Spanish 1800 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] On his arrival in Madrid, Libyan External Secretary 'Umar al-Muntasir said his country is prepared to hand over to a third country—not France or the United States—the two men accused of carrying out an attack in 1988 on a U.S. aircraft that crashed in Lockerbie and killed all 270 passengers.

Arab League Stance on Libya-West 'Crisis' Hailed

LD2209213893 Tripoli Libyan Television Network in Arabic 1930 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] The Secretariat of the General People's Committee for Unity has issued the following statement:

The General People's Committee for Unity received with deep satisfaction the resolution of the Arab League Council during its 100th session, issued on 21 September 1993, endorsing the resolutions of the Committee of Seven on the crisis between the Great Jamahiriyah and the Western states, in which it considered it to be an Arab-Western crisis.

The Committee of Seven stressed its solidarity with the Libyan Arab people and valued the positive initiatives taken by the Great Jamahiriyah. It expressed rejection of the policies of escalation, threats, and ultimatums made by the three Western states. This confirms the Arab collective stand by the Libyan Arab people, which translates the reality of Arab belonging and the unity of the Arab stand in the face of dangers.

While the Secretariat of the General People's Committee for Unity values this collective Arab stand, it expresses pride in the efforts being exerted by the secretary general of the Arab League toward finding a settlement to this crisis through dialogue and negotiations. The affirmation by the Committee of Seven of its intention to continue its efforts and contacts with the UN secretary general and the members of the Security Council in order to avoid any escalation of the crisis and provide the opportunity for a positive and constructive dialogue, is a translation and reaffirmation of the attitude of the Great Jamahiriyah and all its positive initiatives.

Al-Qadhdhafi Addresses Awlad Abu Sayf Citizens

LD2209174293 Tripoli Libyan Television Network in Arabic 2002 GMT 21 Sep 93

[Editorial Report] Tripoli Libyan Television Network in Arabic at 2002 GMT on 21 September carries a two-hour video recording of a visit by Libyan leader Mu'ammar Al-Qadhdhafi to Awlad Abu Sayf. The television carries a 55-minute recording of an address by Mu'ammar Al-Qadhdhafi to citizens of Awlad Abu Sayf. He opens his speech by apologizing for being late, and says: "I am really very happy with the high morale of the Ouled Bousayf tribes, young and old, and when this encounter is publicized it will positively affect the morale of all Libyans, men and women." He goes on to say: "All the nation needs someone to give the lie to the plans for surrender which are now unjustifiably being imposed on it. We are not seeing that the nation has lost all it has, or laid down all its weapons to surrender in this humiliating manner." He then recounts how various countries surrendered in the past to opposing forces, after which he says: "There must be someone to tell the nation that oil is not so serious a matter as to require surrender. Someone must explain that there are other possibilities for oil, and that we should not surrender. As far as Libya is concerned, this must be its position. They say that Libya has a problem with the West,

that it is being blockaded, but matters must be clear: These things cannot lead to surrender." after saying that libya does not need the west, he says: "The nation should realize and the West must understand that we are not being affected by the blockade, the boycott, the air embargo or anything else."

Moving on to regional events he says: "We cannot say Palestine is not Arab, and we cannot neglect Jerusalem and say that it is Israel's capital forever. How could this be? We are more entitled to Jerusalem; be it from the religious point of view, the Muslims are more entitled to it." Continuing his address on the theme of Jerusalem, he says: "Where have the Jews got the right to say that Jerusalem is their capital? From the present international point of view, all of us have equal rights to it—the Muslims, the Jews, and the Christians." He goes on to say: "By God, the talk is not only about Palestine, it is also about Libya, so that it reaches this village, this valley, and influences each one of us. We cannot lie to ourselves and say Palestine is not ours, and in the end sell the nation's struggle and the thousands of martyrs. The whole story boils down to Jericho and Gaza. Jericho and Gaza were in our hands until recently, in 1967. So what happened before 1967 was a lie." He then recalls how the PLO, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip was formed, and says: "We cannot say that due to these circumstances we can lie to ourselves and say that the whole issue is that of Gaza and Jericho. At least the whole world was in agreement on the West Bank and the Gaza Strip for the sake of which the Madrid talks were organized. Therefore, there is no justification whatsoever to abandon this and stick to secret talks which appeared suddenly on the line."

Moving on to events in Somalia, he says: "America will leave Somalia defeated. The Somalis are one people, while America brought with it a number of states." He says that what is happening now is actually a great wrong against the nation, and that "it will bring more wrath, violence and war." He says that the Arab nation must listen to this, and goes on to say he regrets that there are some people who have been influenced by foreign broadcasting, and the propaganda and rumors spread by foreign embassies. He says: "In each foreign embassy there is foreign intelligence machinery. It has a diplomatic immunity. The ambassador tells you this man is an official, or a driver, when in fact he is an officer in the intelligence, in the MOSSAD, the CIA, or any foreign intelligence."

He then goes on to warn other countries not to attempt to strike against Libya, saying "They will be finished if they come as soldiers to Libyan soil."

He returns to the theme of states that have surrendered, some without a struggle, and regrets that some Arab states are among them.

Turning to the United States, he says: "America has changed—America after the end of communism and Reagan and Bush, this new America, the new administration, the Democratic administration, truthfully, is not hostile toward the Arabs [word indistinct]. Even what is happening in Iraq or in Somalia—it was them which (?started it), who involved America, and not the new American Administration. The Arabs (?might think) that the new American Administration is going to be on our side vis-a-vis the Israelis. But let us suppose this would happen; that is if the issue is an issue of interests. The American interests with the Arabs are greater, even if America remains an imperialist state, and stays as an imperialist state, but has interests and no friends. Its interests with the Arabs are 1 million times more than its interests with Israel. America has no economic interests with the Israelis. The opposite is correct. The Americans lose economically with the continuation of its support for Israelis.

"But the Arabs are the ones who have the oil, the gas, and the major market—from the ocean to the Gulf—even from the economic aspect America might be convinced that its interest lies with the Arabs and not with the Israelis. And it might change its attitude. At least if it does not side with the Arabs it lessens the pressures on the Arabs by not backing the Israelis as it used to do in the past. This will lead to weakening the Jewish state even in front of the Palestinian people.

"In truth we have not seen the new American president. With other American presidents we quarrelled for 10 years. First, he is a new President and is young, and he was against the Vietnam war when he was a student. He did not take part in the aggression against any Arab country. He has no colonial file or black file with the Arabs. He was a governor of a small state and he was unknown. There is no problem between him and us."

After recalling relations with the United States over the past 10 years, he says: "There is no problem between us and the new U.S. Defense Department. This present one did not take part in the aggression against us. Nor the American State Department, nor the new American intelligence—its new leadership did not take part in the aggression against us, nor the American President, nor the American national council—these are all new people. O.K. Maybe all this could be in our favor. We are not afraid. When Reagan used to threaten us I would abuse him and abuse his father. We were not afraid of him when his naval fleets were off our shores. We used to tell him: You are absurd. You are Israel's dog and you are absurd and a failed actor. We said these words...[interrupted by applause and shouts] Now Clinton has no fleets which threaten us. Nevertheless, we are saying good words about him . Until now there is no problem with him."

"Some people who are not well informed in the last years were saying that Mu'ammar (?is obsessed) by America and he (?does not) want to clear up the problem and that he is challenging America. No, it is not challenging America. America was the one which challenged me. For here we are. When a new president took over and he had no part in the aggression against us we did not utter a bad word against him. On the contrary we said that the Democrats are our friends and the blacks are our friends, and the American Indians are our friends, and the minorities are our friends, and these are ones who formed the party that

brought Clinton to power. It was the minorities whom we used to support, and they are America. We befriended those who befriended us and antagonized those who antagonized us. If America becomes our friend we will be its friend. If it antagonizes us we are ready to resist. We will not surrender. This should be made clear." [applause]

"Libya has a great responsibility toward the Libyan people. It is the responsibility of every individual among you. First, because you have the authority, and the decision of peace or war or the boycotting of this or that state, or befriending this or that state and the spending of money in the directions of war or peace lies with you. These are things that each of you should (?decide on) at the people's congress in the district. This is one thing. The power is in your hands. You decide everything. The Libyan people are like the American Congress. The American President says: I cannot do anything until Congress decides." He goes on to tell his audience: "You are not resisting for Libya alone, but you are defending the entire Arab nation and its future."

After recalling various battles he says: "There is no person who has a zeal and pride in Arabism more than the tribe of Awlad Abu Sayf. [applause] At the same time there is no person who rigidly follows Islam and the teachings of the prophet more than the Awlad Aby Sayf." [applause]

After further praise for the people of the region, he regrets that women do not receive adequate education and also do not play an important role in society. He then goes on to point out that the region is to be developed and receive all main amenities.

After stressing that Libya belongs to all Libyans, he says "Just imagine if I arm you, and say: This region is a strategic reserve for Gharyan, and Gharyan is a strategic reserve and a second line for Tripoli so that the Western and American enemy, or another will not advance like the Italians did and entered and occupied this region. Imagine that I came and armed these tribes and then came another day, and I would be told: These friends of yours whom you armed are fighting for a well, a woman or a piece of land and everyone of them is saying it is his. If a stupid man uses the rifle I gave him and kills so many people, will one thus not get angry and have regrets. He continues: I am thinking of arming people according to strategic areas and I would set up a first, second, and third line when necessary. I must however be reassured that we are aware of this and we understand that the box which you are given must not be opened until you are about to fight the enemy of Libya and the Arab nation. You should forget you have a rifle until the real enemy arrives. But no matter how much you quarrel with your cousin or your neighbor or anyone else, do not be governed by thinking that you have a rifle in your possession." [applause]

Al-Qadhdhafi ends his address by stating that any weapons must be kept in a safe place and must not be used in personal quarrels or for hunting.

Foreign Liaison, Cuban Officials Hold Talks

LD2209192893 Tripoli JANA in Arabic 1620 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] Tripoli, 22 Sep (JANA)—The brother acting secretary of the General People's Committee for Foreign Liaison and International Cooperation this morning met with Pedro Miret Prieto, Cuban deputy prime minister and State Council member [name, title as received], who is currently visiting the Great Jamahiriyah. Bilateral cooperation between the Great Jamahiriyah and Cuba, and the means to consolidate and develop this cooperation in all spheres in such a way as to serve the two friendly peoples were discussed during the meeting.

Morocco

King Hassan Interviewed on Sahara Issue

LD2209153493 Rabat MAP in English 1236 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] Rabat, Sep 22 (MAP)—'For me the Sahara issue is now a routine affair. It is in the hands of the UN. There is a peace plan that has to be enforced', King Hassan II said in an interview with Portuguese news agency 'LUSA' and daily 'DIARIO DE NOTICIAS'.

On the eve of his state-visit to Portugal, the sovereign talked to the Portuguese media on Moroccan-Portuguese relations, the election process, the role of women in Morocco and the issue of the Moroccan Sahara. The sovereign also ranged over the Israeli- Palestinian accord, the Arab Maghreb Union, fundamentalism, immigration, the Gulf conflict, and the problems in Iraq, Somalia, and Angola.

To a question on 'the deadlock' reached in the Sahara issue, the king explained there [words indistinct] other than the UN peace plan 'which consist for us in having our own peace plan, that is to say to have the Sahrawis back home and have them realize that whether they live in Dakar or Tangier, they all enjoy the same rights and duties (...) This is also a settlement plan. They know it and the ball is in their camp.

Asked whether he was satisfied with the outcome of the legislative elections just held in Morocco, the sovereign said he does not side with any majority nor minority. 'I am with all the parliament and for all the parliament. The outcome of the elections will help me prepare my flight' which 'will not be a quiet flight, there will be some turbulences because the world is facing turbulences, especially in the economic and social fields'.

Answering a question on the role of Moroccan women in the political future of the country, King Hassan II described this role as 'decisive' and said 'Moroccan women ought to participate in the country's life. For women, all sectors are open but to my opinion the most important sector is education which does not exclude other fields but rather complements them'.

'The only thing I am asking them, said the sovereign, is that their role be not performed at the expense of their task as mothers.

On Moroccan-Portuguese relations, the sovereign said his visit to Portugal, like President Soares' earlier trip to Morocco, will represent 'a very important element in bolstering cooperation (...) according to our means of course'.

He added that he would explore with Portuguese interlocutors the possibility to establish a triangular cooperation as 'Portugal is present almost everywhere in the world' and as both Portugal and Morocco are located in front of Brazil and the South American continent which are so promising for the future.

On future prospects of the Arab Maghreb Union 'AMA' in the light of 'the political crisis' in Algeria and the embargo on Libya, King Hassan II insisted the Maghreb is still alive. Let's say it is taking a nap or resting. This does not mean that it is not existing. Structures are existing'. Unfortunately, the sovereign added, 'What could be done is delayed by all these events'.

In less than 2 or 3 years, he predicted, all the process will be re-launched on a new basis. In the meantime, he said, 'the Maghreb is still existing'.

Tackling the fundamentalism problem, the king said 'Europe has known Islam for a long time and up to now there was nothing to fear from the Muslims, living in Europe. 'Islam, he added, is losing its image as a civilization and as a tolerant and constructive religion. This is a pity. But I think that this is a crisis that will fade away.

Dealing with the Arab world and the Middle East, King Hassan II described as 'very important' the Israeli-PLO accord recently signed in Washington and as 'an element which will alleviate turbulences' in the world. To a question on border disputes between some Arab countries of the region, the king pointed out that the dispute between Saudi Arabia and Bahrain, which was anyway of minor importance, has been settled.

Concerning the Gulf crisis, the sovereign said the problem must be seen from a certain angle for we must [words indistinct] the partition of Iraq.

'No Arab country worthy of this name would accept the partition of Iraq' he said 'not even the Saudis and the Kuwaitis. That would create another Yugoslav story, but far more serious, for the region harbors the greatest part of oil reserves'.

[words indistinct] a question on Somalia and the Moroccan participation in [several words indistinct] the sovereign explained that the Moroccan contingent went to Somalia to restore hope, that is why there are more surgeons, midwifes and nurses than soldiers in the Moroccan contingent.

There had been victims, but this was an accident of military operations. It was in no way targeting Moroccans, added the sovereign.

Asked if the UN should negotiate with General Farah Aidid, the sovereign said 'If peace must necessarily go through Farah Aidid, let us go through Farah Aidid'.

'Problems should no longer be associated with persons. In the case of Iraq, you speak of Saddam Husayn in and ignore the 14 million strong Iraqi people. You speak of General Aidid now and in three or six months you might see him at the negotiations table. There should be no preconceived ideas in politics ', the sovereign argued.

Talking about the peace process in Angola, the sovereign said that war has lasted for too long. Unfortunately, it was not a war between Angolans. It was a war between two ideologies where Russia was fighting America. There should be no problem between Angolans.

Savimbi, an old friend of mine and 'a cultured man' and the Angolan president were both for the country's unity and for peace.

Unfortunately, there was this mishap that I do not understand, the sovereign went on.

Concerning the latest UN Security Council resolution on the Angolan conflict, the sovereign said that it is the first time in the history of the UNO that a sanction is decided against an organization. Usually, sanctions are taken against states. I believe that it is an outrageous innovation juridically speaking and not politically, concluded the sovereign.

Sudan

Government Delegation Leaves for Talks With Rebels

AB2209162293 Paris AFP in English 1454 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] Khartoum, 22 Sept (AFP) - A Sudanese government team Wednesday [22 September] flew to Bentiu in Upper Nile state for peace talks with a breakaway faction of the rebel Sudan People's Liberation Army [SPLA], the Sudan news agency SUNA reported.

The team, led by a member of the transitional national assembly, Ahmad Ibrahim al-Tahir, replaced a delegation killed in a fatal Cessna aircraft crash that claimed the lives of all eight people aboard as they headed for Bentiu. That team was headed by Ahmad al-Radi Jabir and included the governor of Upper Nile state, Bol Reth Kuany, and Peace and Development Foundation president Fadlul Sid Abu Gisaisa.

In another development, junta leader 'Umar al-Bashir accused several unnamed Western countries of pressuring his government to relinquish Islamic sharia law—opposed by the rebels—to solve Sudan's problems. Speaking on television late Tuesday, General al-Bashir said the demand had been rejected because "we believe that wealth and victory come from Allah (God)." He called on the people for "more sacrifices", saying this was the "means of salvation with which we fight our enemies."

Hardship and hostility were "good omens, indicating that we are taking the right course and that we shall gain victory," al-Bashir told a delegation from Sinnar in central Sudan, which was the capital of the first Islamic state in Sudan, founded 500 years ago.

Tahir led a government delegation for the first round of peace talks with Riek Machar's breakaway SPLA-United in Nairobi last May, coinciding with another round of similar talks with Colonel John Garang's main SPLA faction in the Nigerian capital Abuja.

The upcoming round will be the third one to be held in Upper Nile in the south of the country. The first two were under the auspices of the new chieftain of the Shuluk tribe, of which the number two in the SPLA-United, former Khartoum university lecturer Lam Akol belongs. Akol has been heading SPLA-United delegations.

Negotiations with Garang's mainstream SPLA, which is still fighting the government to end Islamic domination of the mainly Christian and animist south, has been left to a four-nation committee set up by a recent East African summit meeting in Djibouti. Under the chairmanship of Kenyan President Daniel arap Moi, the heads of state of Ethiopia, Uganda and Eritrea are members.

Official Says Relief Flights to South Continue

EA2109172893 Khartoum SUNA in English 0955 GMT 21 Sep 93

[Text] Khartoum, 21 Sep (SUNA)—General Commissioner for Relief and Rehabilitation Awad Khalifah denied in a statement the foreign mass media false allegations that Sudan's Government prohibited aeroplanes coming from Entebbe (Uganda) to reach the affected areas in the south. He also confirmed that these news were false, lacking evidences and credibility and issued by irresponsible bodies. He added that these allegations are inconsistent with the fact that facilities have been provided by Sudan Government to help the affected people in southern Sudan without any discrimination. Awad meanwhile confirmed the continuation of air relief operations to the south from within and outside Sudan. He explained that these allegations, which were issued by two European organizations, indicate that the aggressive attacks against Sudan will not stop despite their lack of evidences and credibility.

Civilians Appointed To Replace Military Governors

PM2209100193 London AL-HAYAH in Arabic 17 Sep 93 p 7

[Reports by Kamal Hamid in Khartoum and Hasan Sandarusi in Washington: "Al-Bashir Dismisses Two Military Governors and Appoints Civilians for the First Time"]

[Excerpt] Sudanese President Lieutenant General 'Umar Hasan al-Bashir yesterday issued a decree relieving the military governors of the Northern and Equatorial Governorates of their duties and, for the first time since he assumed power in 1989, appointed two civilian governors to replace them.

Al-Bashir replaced Major General Musa'id al-Nuwayri with Ahmad al-Sharif Badr as governor of the Northern Governorate and replaced Major General Esterlino Arika with Angelo Bida [names as transliterated] as governor of the Equatorial Governorate in southern Sudan.

There are rumors in Khartoum that al-Bashir also intends to relieve Revolution Command Council Member and Information Minister Brigadier General Sulayman Muhammad Sulayman of his cabinet post. It has been noted that in recent weeks the minister was absent from his office and did not participate in the conference on "Sudan and International Information," which was organized by his ministry but was supervised by Presidential Affairs Minister Dr. Ghazi Salah al-Din, who is the strongest candidate for the post of information minister, particularly as he is the chairman of the Foreign Information Council attached to it.

Meanwhile, Sudanese Justice Minister 'Abd-al-'Aziz Shiddu has confirmed that the investigations regarding the case of the suspects accused of plotting to plant explosives and carry out assassinations in Khartoum have been completed and that 12 suspects will be brought to trial soon. [passage omitted]

Al-Bashir Reaffirms Stand on PLO-Israeli Accord

EA2209195093 Omdurman Sudan Broadcasting Service Network in Arabic 1300 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Excerpt] Lieutenant General 'Umar al-Bashir, chairman of the Revolution Command Council and of the Council of Ministers, has reaffirmed Sudan's firm stand towards the Israeli-Palestinian accord. He said Sudan stands by the Palestinian option and all that leads to the preservation of Palestinian rights.

His Excellency affirmed the necessity of the unity of Palestinian ranks to prevent an internal Palestinian conflict and the liquidation of the Palestinian uprising. This came during his meeting today with information and press chiefs at the General Secretariat of the Council of Ministers.

Lt. Gen. al-Bashir called for the unity of Arab and Islamic ranks in order to preserve the entity of the nation and its interests. [passage omitted]

Sudanese-Egyptian Prisoner Exchange Slated

EA2109212793 Khartoum SUNA in Arabic 1420 GMT 21 Sep 93

[Text] Cairo, 21 Sep (SUNA)—The release of Sudanese detained in Egyptian prisons will take place during the next few days as a result of contacts with Egypt. Subsequently, the Egyptians detained in Sudanese prisons will also be released. This was announced in a statement to MENA by Foreign Minister Husayn Sulayman Abu-Salih.

Dr. Abu-Salih stressed that the American accusations that certain Sudanese diplomats were involved in terrorist acts were baseless, referring in this respect to the statement of former President Jimmy Carter on the American decision in which the latter had pointed out that the American

administration had put forward no evidence to support its accusation of terrorism against Sudan.

Dr. Abu-Salih reiterated that the government was trying to resolve the problem of the south, noting that the Inter-Governmental Authority on Drought and Development summit had formed a quadripartite committee chaired by Kenyan President Daniel arap Moi with the participation of the states bordering on Sudan to mediate between the government and the rebels.

Tunisia

Israeli Foreign Ministry Team Arrives for Talks

TA2009192693 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 1600 GMT 20 Sep 93

[Text] The Foreign Ministry delegation has arrived in Tunis to deal with technical matters associated with the upcoming multilateral talks on refugee affairs, which begin there in October. The team includes political adviser Shlomo Gur, Yosi Gal, and Nisim Ben-Shetrit. The Tunisian Interior Ministry banned cameramen and journalists from covering their arrival at the airport. The delegation left for their hotel in a U.S. Embassy vehicle under heavy security.

Preparation for Talks Reported

TA2209151593 Tel Aviv HA'ARETZ in Hebrew 22 Sep 93 p A5

[Report by political correspondent Hemi Shalev]

[Excerpts] The Tunisian authorities yesterday made a sharp shift in their treatment of the Israeli delegation currently in Tunisia and allowed a broad exposure of the visit in the local media. They also organized numerous meetings between the Israeli delegates and technical experts of the Tunisian administration.

Shlomo Gur, political adviser to Deputy Foreign Minister Yosi Beilin, and Yosi Gal and Nisim Ben-Shetrit, both Foreign Ministry deputy directors general, will meet this morning with Tunisian communications and logistics experts for initial coordination of the preparations for the convention of the multilateral committee on refugees to be held in Tunis next month. [passage omitted]

The Israeli delegates said that they are unaware of an intention to arrange meetings with figures in the PLO headquarters in Tunis. They made the remarks in response to reports in Israel and Tunis of a possible meeting between the Israeli delegates and a Palestinian team headed by Abu-Mazin [Mahmud 'Abbas].

The United States yesterday announced that it would soon set up a subcommittee of the multilateral process' steering committee to urgently discuss the changes called for on this track in view of the agreement between Israel and the Palestinians. Deputy Foreign Minister Yosi Beilin yesterday summoned the heads of the Israeli delegations to the multilateral committees for an initial discussion of this issue .

In the discussion, an estimate was made that the agreement will have contradicting effects on the multilateral process: On the one hand, various projects that were pending progress in the peace process may now become practical, mainly in the territories. On the other hand, it could be assumed that budgets earmarked for economic development in the territories will now be taken from resources previously intended for regional projects in the multilateral framework.

Political sources in Jerusalem expressed the fear that all the budgets of the multilateral process will be directed to the territories. According to the sources, the projects discussed in the various committees are a major incentive for the countries in the region to enter various fields of cooperation with Israel.

Following the agreement with the PLO, the main discussion of the problem of the uprooted and refugees will now be moved from the multilateral to the bilateral track. Additional changes will follow from the fact that PLO members will now join all the forums of the multilateral negotiations. [passage omitted]

* GCC Debates Financial Aid to Palestinians

93P50296A London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT in Arabic 13 Sep 93 p 4

[Report by 'Abd-al-'Aziz al-Sadiq]

[Text] Abu Dhabi—Informed sources in Abu Dhabi have said that the Arab Gulf Cooperation Council [GCC] countries have been debating among themselves over GCC financial support for the Palestinian ruling entity.

These sources said that the GCC financial support figure going around is in the several hundreds of millions of dollars, and that there is no truth to what is being said about several billion.

These sources added that among the proposed alternatives is making GCC support for Palestine part of the aid fund that the Damascus declaration decided on, when it determined that member countries would participate in it with about 6.5 billion dollars.

These sources ruled out offering the GCC support in one payment, favoring a time schedule that is spread over a number of years and following such project financing as is agreed upon.

Kuwait

Army Chief of General Staff Talks to 'AL-ANBA

LD2209193393 Kuwait KUNA in Arabic 0749 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] Kuwait, 22 Sep (KUNA)—The Kuwait Chief of the General Staff, Staff Major General 'Ali Muhammad al-Mu'min said in a press statement published here today that the chiefs of the staff of the Gulf Cooperation Council [GCC] armies will debate the issues and the military affairs that concern the area in October.

Al-Mu'min added in his statement to the paper 'AL-ANBA that the formation of a Gulf military force will be one of the issues that will be raised during the meeting that will be held in Abu Dhabi. He stressed that this matter has been agreed upon by the military leaderships of the GCC states within a general orientation to create a Gulf force that will deter any probable external threats.

As for military coordination between the six members states of the GCC, he explained that there are consultations about the armament projects of each state with commitment to safeguarding the freedom of each of these states in choosing the necessary weapon each will need in accordance with each state environmental requirement, and the source of the weapons and safeguarding the special requirements of each state.

Al-Mu'min said that the Kuwaiti Army has not recovered its previous capabilities before the tyrant Iraqi invasion. He noted that the army had not reached the degree of deterrent with regard to equipment and armaments, while the combat ability of the Kuwait soldier has been raised, especially from the mobilization aspect.

He said that the military establishment has been exposed to a greater degree of destruction than that which had occurred against the institutions of the state. For example, 95 percent of the installations of the land forces had been destroyed and only 70 percent of these were restored, while the naval forces sustained 90 percent destruction. They are under a stage of restoration under which 70 percent have been restored. As for the Kuwaiti Air Force, 61 percent of this force had been restored.

About arming the Kuwaiti Naval Force Al-Mu'min said that it is still under study with regard to supplying it with the major units. However, the patrol and pursuit units have been chosen. He stressed that the army has the complete freedom to choose the source of the weaponry and the units most suitable for operation in the naval force.

He explained that the Kuwaiti Army is in the process of developing a pioneering training project turning it into a field project in the coming year.

Al-Mu'min explained that accepting volunteers with unspecified nationality into the army is not acceptable at the present time unless the state changes its attitude in this connection.

Saudi Arabia

Industrial Development Detailed for National Day

LD2009154593 Riyadh SPA in English 1239 GMT 20 Sep 93

[Text] Riyadh, Sept 20, SPA—More than 175,000 workers are now employed in Saudi Arabia's 2,036 productive factories, which have helped to diversify sources of the national income and provide a strong national industrial base in the country.

These factories have gleaned over all parts of the Kingdom with a huge capital investment of nearly SR 138.5 billion. They produce important industrial products like chemicals, plastic products, building materials, metal products and foodstuffs.

Saudi Arabia's development plans have focused on diversifying the sources of income. In the last 15 years, the Kingdom has made big strides in the field of industry—thanks to the great efforts exerted by the Saudi Government to set up a strong national industrial base.

The industrial sector along with the agricultural sector has lessened the country's dependence on the revenues of oil.

A careful examination of figures and statistics shows the transformation of the Kingdom from an importer of all its requirements to a manufacturing and exporting nation of several products.

In the rapid industrial growth of the Kingdom, the Saudi Arabian Basic Industries Corporation (SABIC), established in 1976, has played a useful and dynamic role. The corporation, which includes 15 industrial complexes, has introduced the most sophisticated technology for production of metal products, fertilizers and petrochemical materials.

The net profits of SABIC, which is marketing its products in more than 70 countries, amounted to SR 1,960 million in 1992.

SABIC's productive capacity jumped to about 15.7 million tons in 1992 from 13.1 million tons in 1991. The value of its sales also increased to SR 14.5 billion from SR 13.4 billion during the same period.

In 1992, the number of SABIC's workers reached 11,137 including 6,788 Saudis (about 61 per cent).

In order to move ahead on the path of industrial development, SABIC has set up industrial cities at a cost of SR 1.9 billion (with the exclusion of the industrial cities in Jubail and Yanbu).

The Saudi Industrial Development Fund (SIDF) has been contributing positively towards the process of industrial development.

Up to the end of the fiscal year 1411-1412 H [24 July 1990 - 13 July 1991], SIDF extended loans worth more than SR 13.9 billion to the national factories.

The kingdom has also made fine progress in the electricity sector. By the end of 1412 h, The productive capacity of the electricity companies in the Kingdom reached 17,000 megawatts. This figure is equivalent to more than 14 times the productive capacity in 1395 (1975).

The length of the electricity networks reached 15,000 kilometers by the end of 1412 H while the length of distribution networks reached more than 83,000 km.

During the same year, electric services were available in 5,990 cities, villages and hamlets. These services were provided to 2,587,000 subscribers.

The electricity sector now employs 26,342 persons. Of this number, 60 per cent are Saudis.

In line with the state's directive, the electricity companies have set up a number of training centers to prepare the national cadres, capable of working in this important sector.

United Arab Emirates

* Dispute With Iran Over Islands Continues

93P50294A

[Editorial Report] London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT on 11 and 12 September 1993 on pp 1, 4 carried reports by 'Abd-al-'Aziz al-Sadiqi and Taj-al-Din 'Abd-al-Haq from Abu Dhabi on the Iran-UAE dispute over Abu Musa and the Tunb Islands.

On 11 September, AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT reported that informed sources in Abu Dhabi said that the UAE will raise the subject of its differences with Iran about the three islands at the UN.

The sources added that the UAE had hesitated to push the matter of the islands in the UN in order to give direct dialogue with Iran a chance, but that this had not led to any results due to the refusal of Iran to go into the question of the islands and due to its blockage of discussion of sovereignty over Abu Musa. According to the sources, the UAE was waiting for Iran to issue an official communique on the visit of Shaykh Hamdan Bin-Zayid to Iran, which included guidance similar to that issued subsequent to the visit of Iranian Foreign Minister Velayati to Abu Dhabi in May. However, UAE officials in the UAE were surprised by the extreme statements made by the Iranian Foreign Ministry spokesman on Tuesday [7 September] criticizing the Gulf Cooperation Council foreign ministers' communique on the islands, which they claimed was conciliatory due to the UAE's calming influence. The sources said that the UAE felt that the Velayati communique may have been an attempt on Iran's part to keep the UAE from dealing with the subject of the islands in regional or international circles.

On 12 September, AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT quoted diplomatic sources as saying that indications in the statements of the Iranian Foreign Ministry spokesman and in the commentary of Tehran radio on the cancellation of UAE Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Shaykh Hamdan Bin-Zayid Al Nuhayyan's visit to Iran reflects "a slight change" in the Iranian position, but that this change would not lead to the UAE's taking back the decision to cancel the visit unless additional data is provided to justify the reversal.

The paper says that these sources believe the Iranian statements may aim at containing the UAE's annoyance at previous "extreme" Iranian official statements about the islands being Iranian.

The change which they detected lay in the fact that Iranian official radio carried a complete paragraph of the UAE Foreign Ministry's communique in which it was mentioned that the visit was cancelled due to Tehran's not agreeing to discuss the quarrel over the islands. This is the first time that an official Iranian organ had mentioned that there was such a quarrel. They added that the Iranian Foreign Ministry spokesman's statements had not closed the door to a visit, since he indicated "Iran's readiness to accept the UAE minister of state for foreign affairs." The sources also noted in a TEHRAN TIMES commentary "yesterday" that "the visit would have dealt specifically with the subject of the differences over the islands."

Paper Criticizes 'Arafat's 'Bitter Deception'

JN2209114793 Baghdad INA in Arabic 0930 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Excerpt] Baghdad, 22 Sep (INA)—AL-THAWRAH has asserted that Yasir 'Arafat has turned the so-called Gaza-Jericho agreement into a bridge for Zionists to cross into Arab capitals, having failed so far to occupy them militarily.

In part three of its editorial signed by "an observer," the paper says: Mr. Yasir 'Arafat did not act like al-Sadat, who negotiated and agreed unilaterally with the Zionist entity while keeping those concerned informed about the so-called peaceful solutions. As a matter of fact, 'Arafat did the opposite when he gave certain information at the same time he was taking surreptitious steps toward concluding the so-called Gaza-Jericho agreement.

The paper wonders: Can there be a harsher, worse, and more bitter deception than this? Why did Yasir 'Arafat carry out all these maneuvers instead of telling the bitter truth as it is?

The paper says the agreement has turned the Palestinians who go along with it, into a bridge for the entity, in cooperation with world Zionism, to control the resources of the Arab nation through a different kind of occupation that usurps the components of strength from the foundations of sovereignty.

The paper stresses that Jericho and Gaza alone cannot absorb the Palestinian emigrants. All of Palestine—stemming from the national depth of the act of liberation—can alone accommodate the Palestinians to live in dignity and prosperity while the homeland enjoys full sovereignty. [passage omitted]

Further Commentary on 'Arafat, Accord

JN2309120893 Baghdad INA in Arabic 0746 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Excerpt] Baghdad, 23 Sep (INA)—The newspaper AL-THAWRAH has described the Gaza-Jericho agreement as the fruit of the Zionist and Yasir 'Arafat's concern over their future.

In the last part of its four-part editorial entitled "The Agreement Between Yasir 'Arafat and the Zionist Entity," the paper, organ of the Arab Socialist Ba'th Party, says: As a result of many changes, foremost of which are the outbreak of the stone revolution, Iraq's victory over Iran, its steadfastness in the face of the 30-state aggression, and the results of the Zionist invasion of Lebanon, Israel has found that building the State of Israel in accordance with the from the Nile to the Euphrates slogan necessitates, under current circumstances, some sort of maneuvering away from military moves.

The paper notes that Israel has also begun to fear serious developments in the Arab homeland, particularly in Egypt. Therefore, it cooked up the Gaza-Jericho formula to use as both a defensive and offensive mechanism in dealing with the present and the future.

AL-THAWRAH touches on the causes of worry of 'Arafat and his leadership, which encouraged him to accept the agreement which was made by the underground lobbies of the imperialists, Zionists, and traitors of the nation. It says: Foremost of these causes is the development of the Zionist-Palestinian conflict in the occupied territories and the emergence of new leaderships to lead the conflict inside the occupied territories. It stresses that these leaderships and the Palestinian national leaderships began to occupy their position so seriously that they were about to present themselves as the new field alternative inside the occupied territories to Yasir 'Arafat's leadership outside the occupied territories.

The paper says: 'Arafat's fear of these new leaderships and his concern over the possibility that his leadership outside the occupied territories would become something of the past encouraged him to make new calculations far away from the struggle option.

AL-THAWRAH emphasizes: The Zionists will never abrogate their slogan: "From the Nile to the Euphrates is the Land of Israel." They will continue to encourage world Zionists to come to occupied Palestine. They will find now and in the future, regardless of their tactics under the current or any circumstances, that the continuation of this slogan is necessary to win World Zionism's sympathy and support for their entity in occupied Palestine. [passage omitted]

Saddam Meets Swedish Envoy, Orders Release of 3 Swedes

JN2209180493 Baghdad INA in Arabic 1740 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] Baghdad, 22 Sep (INA)—His Excellency President Saddam Husayn has ordered the release of three Swedes who had received prison terms for entering Iraqi territory illegally.

After receiving a personal envoy of His Majesty King Carl Gustaf of Sweden today, his excellency the president ordered the repatriation of the aforesaid Swedes.

During his meeting with Swedish envoy Hanok Evrok [name as received], chief of the Royal Swedish Court, His Excellency President Saddam Husayn received a written message from His Majesty King Carl Gustaf of Sweden, containing his greetings as well as his request that the aforesaid three Swedes be released.

The order by His Excellency President Saddam Husayn to release the aforesaid three Swedes came about in recognition of the good ties between the two countries, and also in appreciation of the letter of His Majesty King Carl Gustaf of Sweden.

The meeting between His Excellency President Saddam Husayn and the Swedish envoy was attended by Presidential Office Chief Hatim Hamdan al-'Azzawi and Foreign Ministry Under Secretary Riyad Mahmud al-Qaysi.

Freed Swedes Commend Treatment

JN2209192893 Baghdad INA in Arabic 1845 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] Baghdad, 22 Sep (INA)—The three Swedes, whose release and repatriation have been ordered by His Excellency President Saddam Husayn, have affirmed that the Iraqi authorities treated them well during their imprisonment.

At a news conference, attended by correspondents of foreign news agencies and television station networks, and a correspondent of the Iraqi News Agency, held at the al-Rashid Hotel in Baghdad today, the three Swedes, Stefan Welbort, Lif Mesporn, and Christarkrom Green [names as received], said they have been in constant touch with their families, particularly since the Iraqi authorities allowed their families to visit them several times.

The three Swedes added that the Iraqi authorities extended every possible assistance to them by obtaining entry visas for them for the countries they will transit on their way to Sweden.

The release of the three Swedish nationals came about in response to a request made by King Carl Gustaf of Sweden. This request was relayed to His Excellency President Saddam Husayn by the chief of the Swedish Royal Court, a personal envoy of the Swedish monarch, when his excellency the president received him today.

Recent U.S. Airspace 'Violations' Protested to UN

JN1609101293 Baghdad INA in Arabic 0900 GMT 16 Sep 93

[Text] New York, 16 Sep (INA)—Iraq has lodged a complaint with the United Nations over the violations of its airspace by U.S. aircraft for purposes of surveillance and harassment.

In a protest memorandum addressed to UN Secretary General Dr. Butrus Ghali yesterday, Iraq affirmed that these aircraft violated Iraqi airspace during period 7-12 September. These aircraft conducted 507 hostile air sorties during that period. The flights of these aircraft centered over various areas in northern and southern Iraq.

The memorandum indicated that a U.S. TR-1 spy plane violated Iraqi airspace on 9 September. Its flights centered over al-Basrah, Qal'at Salih, al-Shatrah, southern al-Qadisiyah, southern al-Najaf, al-Samawah, and Artawi. Afterward, this plane flew back to Saudi territory.

'Spy Plane' Flights Protested

JN2209180193 Baghdad INA in Arabic 1130 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] New York, 22 Sep (INA)—Iraq has strongly condemned violations of its airspace by the U.S. U-2 spy plane under the pretext of conducting aerial surveys for the Special Commission.

A letter sent by the foreign minister to UN Secretary General Butrus Butrus-Ghali said the U-2 plane violated Iraq's airspace on 10, 13, 15, and 17 September, taking off from Saudi territory and flying over large areas of Iraq.

The letter explained that these four violations raised the total of violations to 167, affirming that this plane is being used for purposes other than those defined by the Security Council and that its activity prejudices Iraq's security and sovereignty.

Arab League Informed of Allied Airspace 'Violations'

12-13 Sep Sorties Reported

JN1709113293 Baghdad INA in Arabic 0924 GMT 17 Sep 93

[Text] Cairo, 19 Sep (INA)— U.S., British, and French aircraft have continued to violate Iraqi airspace because the Saudi and Kuwaiti rulers continued to provide facilities to them.

In a protest letter addressed to the Arab League secretary general, the Iraqi permanent representative to the Arab League said that these aircraft conducted 84 hostile air sorties on 12-13 September.

Iraq requested that this letter, to which a list detailing these violations was attached, be circulated among Arab League members.

16-17 Sep 'Violations' Noted

JN2109124593 Baghdad Republic of Iraq Radio Network in Arabic 1030 GMT 21 Sep 93

[Text] Iraq has informed the Arab League that the Saudi and Kuwaiti rulers continue to extend facilities to the U.S., British, and French aircraft which violate Iraqi airspace and threaten Iraq's security, sovereignty, and national unity.

In a letter to Arab League Secretary General Dr. 'Ismat 'Abd-al-Majid yesterday, Iraq's permanent League representative said these aircraft violated Iraqi airspace on 16 and 17 September, carrying out 50 hostile air sorties after taking off from bases in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. He attached to his letter a list detailing these violations.

18 Sep Sorties Protested

JN2209174393 Baghdad Republic of Iraq Radio Network in Arabic 1400 GMT 22 Sep p93

[Text] Iraq has informed the Arab League that the Kuwaiti and Saudi rulers have continued to provide facilities to U.S., British, and French aircraft to violate the Iraqi airspace, noting that this seriously jeopardizes Iraq's security, sovereignty, and national unity.

In a letter addressed to Arab League Secretary General Dr. 'Ismat 'Abd-al-Majid, the Iraqi permanent representative to the Arab League said that these aircraft violated the Iraqi airspace on 18 September, carrying out 60 hostile air sorties, flying from bases in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait.

The Iraqi permanent representative to the Arab League, who enclosed with his letter a list detailing these airspace violations, asked that the letter be circulated among the Arab League members so they may learn of these regrettable incidents.

Accord 'In Principle' With Syria Initialed

TA2309092593 Tel Aviv 'AL HAMISHMAR in Hebrew 23 Sep pp 1, 4

[Report by Pe'erli Shahar and Pinhas 'Inbari]

[Excerpt] A senior Labor party minister yesterday told 'AL HAMISHMAR that Israel and Syria have initialed an agreement in principle on an Israeli withdrawal from the Golan Heights and its recognition of Syria's sovereignty over the area. For its part, Syria has committed itself to establish full normalization with Israel. The minister added that the understandings will go into effect in four months. The minister asserted that Prime Minister Yitzhaq Rabin aims to reach peace agreements with Syria, Jordan, and Lebanon by the end of 1994.

The minister said that agreement had been reached on a meeting between Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad and Yitzhaq Rabin in approximately two months, noting that following the accord with the Palestinians, it was clear that the negotiations with Jordan would be accelerated. The minister said that the negotiations with Lebanon will also take off once an declaration of principles has been signed with Syria.

The senior minister added that Rabin has decided to hold up the negotiations with Syria and wait until public opinion is ripe for such an arrangement. The prevailing assumption is that within two or three months, after the negotiations with the Palestinians move onto a positive track and public support for the agreement with the Palestinians increases, the climate will become suitable for making the agreements with Syria public.

It should be noted that this is the main reason behind Syrian President al-Asad's refusal to meet with Prime Minister Rabin. Al-Asad wants to meet with Rabin at the same time that Israel declares its readiness to withdraw from the Golan Heights in order to demonstrate to his people the achievements Syria can attain through the negotiations. [passage omitted]

'Sources' Deny Reports of Accord

TA2209163693 Tel Aviv IDF Radio in Hebrew 1500 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Report by Netan'el Semrik]

[Text] Sources in Jerusalem have sharply denied reports that an agreement with Syria is imminent. Sources in the prime minister's bureau told us a short time ago that the reports according to which Israel has already agreed to a withdrawal on the Golan Heights are completely untrue. The sources said that no agreement was reached, therefore there is no Israeli agreement for a withdrawal on the Golan Heights, no timetable has been set, and no border lines have been demarcated.

Political sources in Jerusalem termed comments made by Husni Mubarak this morning regarding a withdrawal on the Golan Heights over a period of several months as totally baseless.

Senior sources in the Foreign Ministry also downplayed reports regarding an agreement of principles which is supposedly in the offing between Israel and Syria.

We must recall, however, that when the initial reports regarding Shim'on Peres' meetings with a senior PLO official in Sweden cropped up several weeks ago, they met with a firm denial by sources in Peres' office. Later it transpired that even if no talks were held in Stockholm, they were indeed held in Oslo.

It is in the nature of such secret contacts that official confirmation will come from Jerusalem only when the puzzle will be completed.

Rabin Said To Expect Majority Favoring PLO Accord

TA2209130893 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 1200 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] Associates of the prime minister say Yitzhaq Rabin's position is that even a majority of 61 Knesset members [MK] in favor of the agreements with the Palestinians is valid. This is why the prime minister does not intend to call an early election if the agreements are approved with such a majority, the associates say.

Knesset Debate From 21 Sep Reported

TA2209171093 Tel Aviv HA'ARETZ in Hebrew 22 Sep 93 p A2

[Report by Knesset correspondent Gid'on Alon]

[Text] One after the other, for nine consecutive hours yesterday, dozens of ministers and Knesset members [MK's] walked to the podium in the plenum to voice their position, either for or against the agreement with the PLO. Most of these were predictable, with coalition members speaking in favor of the agreement and opposition members vehemently opposing it. The exception was Likud MK Me'ir Shitrit, who admitted to being seriously distressed and said he would make up his mind shortly before the vote. Two other Likud MK's, Roni Milo and As'ad As'ad, who did not take the podium, are still wavering and will apparently abstain, despite heavy pressure exerted on them by Likud leaders.

During the debate, held in a subdued tone and without any major upheavals, several MK's voiced their outrage at the fact that there were no cabinet ministers in the hall to hear their criticism. Chairing the session, MK Rafi Edri at one point warned that if a cabinet minister did not enter the hall shortly he would adjourn the debate. Soon afterward Minister Hayim Ramon walked in.

In his speech, Meretz chairman MK Ran Kohen said: "Today we are making history, because for the first time in 110 years citizens in the State of Israel will not be living by their swords alone."

Tzomet leader Refa'el Eytan said: "The declaration of principles with the terrorists will destroy a tier in our defense line by turning Jericho into an excellent bridgehead for an attack on Jerusalem." According to him, anybody

negotiating with one terror organization is ultimately bound to negotiate with all other terror organizations.

Labor's Secretary General Nisim Zvili said: It is clear to us that we are taking certain risks upon ourselves, just as it is clear that the agreement entails vast chances. In his opinion, one must not see the Palestinians just as enemies, but also as human beings.

Moledet leader Rehav'am Ze'evi emphasized that Rabin and Peres were not bringing peace to Israel, "but bidding farewell to the Jewish state." He added: "This peace is a lie and an illusion. It is a surrender to terror; a peace of losers, a peace of falsehoods and hallucinations."

Police Minister Moshe Shahal said: There is a dichotomy between what is happening in the Knesset and what the public feels, and that is why the polemics in the plenum are irrelevant to reality and to those feelings. According to him, the agreement of principles with the PLO does not deviate from the Camp David accords, which state that "Israel will talk with Palestinians residing in Judaea, Samaria, and Gaza and with other Palestinians to be agreed on by the sides." He added that when asked what would happen if one of those Palestinians was a PLO representative, Prime Minister Menahem Begin had replied: "We will not check identity cards."

Zvulun Hammer of the National Religious Party rejected Shahal's remarks, saying the agreement with the PLO did not constitute an extension of the Camp David accords. "It is an entirely different story. The autonomy you propose will, by definition, lead to a Palestinian state with Jerusalem as its capital and to the fulfillment of the right of return," he said.

Labor's Ori Or, chairman of the Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee, said one could not ignore that the agreement entails risks "stemming from the fact that for the first time in history we will be allowing the Arabs to run their own affairs. We do not know yet whether they will manage to build a police force mechanism, uphold the law, and establish a court system to handle their affairs. On the other hand, this agreement also entails many chances because this will have been the first time in 100 years that both sides want to have peace in the Gaza Strip."

Likud's Dan Tikhon said the border of the Palestinian state would cross 100 meters from his living room in Jerusalem's Ramot neighborhood. "Will I need a visa to go from the living room to the kitchen? I have a 10-month-old grandchild, and in another 15 years he will ask me: Grandpa, how could you have passed a resolution that meant war and/or the annihilation of the State of Israel?"

Minister Shulamit Aloni of Meretz said the agreement was the greatest hope Israel had for a secure life. "I too, have grandchildren, and I do not want them to ask me why we did not stop the wars," she said. She called on the Likud leaders to calm down the demonstrators and denounced the calls of "traitor" addressed at Rabin. "I am anxious and apprehensive about the ongoing rabble-rousing, such as billboards calling to excommunicate and put a curse on anybody supporting this peace," she noted.

Likud's Beni Begin said our security is in jeopardy the moment the fundamental principle of our right over Eretz Yisra'el is compromised. According to him, our daily security will be in jeopardy because we will no longer have authority over the territory which will be handed over to the administrative council, while internal security will be handed over to an Arab council. He noted that according to the agreement with the PLO, Israel would not be able to deal with terrorist attacks against Israeli citizens in Kefar Sava or Ashqelon.

[A report by Daniyel Ben-Simon on page 3 of Tel Aviv DAVAR in Hebrew on 22 September adds comments by Likud's Dov Shilansky, who said the entire Knesset debate was a deception "to make the agreement look democratic." In his opinion, Rabin signed the agreements with the PLO unconditionally, so the most the MK's can do is "let off steam."

["Bluntly" addressing himself to the Arab MK's, Tzomet's Gonen Segev said: "Behave like knights of democracy on this issue. Do not vote because your vote affects a Jewish issue, and Arab MK's should not determine the fate of Israel's Jews."]

Rabin Views Israel-PLO Accord, Ties With Syria

LD2209135993 London ITV Television Network in English 1800 GMT 21 Sep 93

[Interview with Prime Minister Yitzhaq Rabin in Israel by Jon Snow in London on 21 September; from the "Channel Four" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Snow] How, on the first day of the Knesset debate, do you assess the state of your accord with the PLO?

[Rabin] It's the first agreement ever signed between Palestinians and Israel or Palestinians and Jews before the creation of the State of Israel. We are negotiating from a standpoint of strength, after all the Palestinians have never presented any threat to the very existence of Israel or to the security of Israel as a state. They have carried out terror, violence, activities that kill and endangered the life of Israelis. They are a threat to the personal security of Israelis, not to the security of Israel.

[Snow] Prime Minister, what then do you imagine your relationship with the PLO and with 'Arafat will be? I mean, will you speak to each other on the phone once he is living in Gaza or Jericho?

[Rabin] The whole structure of the implementation of the declaration of principle is first to start in Gaza and Jericho—Jericho is a small town, there is no meaning. The Gaza strip is a complicated one, we will have to tackle it and to see how it works. From our point of view the security of the Israelis—we have not given up the security of Israelis, the settlements there, and external security in the area from the sea, from the land, from the outside of these territories. While we will negotiate, in the meantime, the structure of the council that will run the self-governing life of the Palestinians, the number of members of the council, its real duties, and the modalities of the elections that, in accordance to, the Palestinians will be elected.

[Snow] Prime Minister, none of this is going to work well unless you really do manage to get the Syrians on board in the whole process. Are you any closer now, do you think, to a deal with Syria than you were in Washington last week?

[Rabin] I don't believe that there is such a relation that you have described. Between our capabilities—when I say our capabilities I refer to the Palestinians and us, Israel, to implement what we were committed by the exchange of letters and the signing of the deal.

[Snow] Except, Prime Minister, the problem surely is that there are extreme Palestinian groups still harbored in Syria, and until there is a real understanding between you and the Syrians isn't there the danger that those radicals will wreck what you are doing?

[Rabin] No. The main danger within the Palestinians to what has been agreed between us and the PLO and the Palestinians that support the very existence of the peace negotiations is the extreme Islamic terrorist groups like the Hamas [Islamic Resistance Movement] and Islamic Jihad. Today they are much stronger than all the 10 rejectionist Palestinian groups that are located in Syria. They are the main threat to the continuation of what we have agreed on, because they by their ideology, by their fanatic interpretation of the Koran, they oppose the very existence of Israel and they declare time and again that will continue to carry out terror activities, with the purpose not only to kill Israelis but to kill the peace process.

[Snow] Then on the question of Syria what has to be done to produce a peace accord with Syria?

[Rabin] Well, we will continue our negotiations with Syria, Lebanon, and Jordan. But we have first to see what has been agreed on, and start to be implemented in the proper way, and in a way Gaza and Jericho is some sort of a pilot plan, to see does it work, this will be the most decisive factor—for us the security of Israel and Israelis and Israeli settlements in the Gaza strip, for the Gazans to what extent they see hope, even some light at the end of the tunnel, to improve their conditions. Before that, before we see it being implemented I don't believe that it will be advisable to Israel to embark on another move that might be painful to Israel.

[Snow] So what kind of a time scale are we looking at?

[Rabin] Well, I believe also we must expect on the part of Syria showing greater support to every move towards peace. Why the Syrians allow the 10 organizations that reject—not us, they reject the PLO and the Palestinians in the territories—that to my humble opinion most of them prefer to see the beginning of solution of their difficulties, of their misery. Why Syria cannot prevent those whose headquarters are located on Syrian soil, their radio station broadcasts attacks on those Palestinians that have decided to negotiate and reach agreement with us. Why do Syrians continue to encourage and to help the Hizballah to continue to attack us from south Lebanon? We would like to see better signs on the part of Syria that it collaborates with the overall effort to achieve peace and not try to undermine one sector on which we have achieved agreement, and no doubt that in the past everybody considered to be the heart of the Arab-Israeli conflict, the agreement with the Palestinians.

Katyusha Reportedly Lands in Qiryat Shemona

TA2209124393 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 1225 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Report from the north by Yo'av Aviv—live]

[Excerpts] A Katyusha rocket fell near Qiryat Shemona several minutes before 1400 [1200 GMT]. The rocket fell in an open field, exploded, and caused no damage. The security forces are on site at this time as well.

Earlier, at around 1200, terrorists opened light weapon fire at an SLA [South Lebanese Army] post on the Sujud ridge. No one was hurt and no damage was caused there as well. [passage omitted]

So far, no Lebanese organization has assumed responsibility for the firing of the Katyusha, and it is reasonable to assume that none will. The organizations do not assume responsibility for attacks, mainly if they involve Israeli northern settlements. This was the first time a Katyusha has fallen in the Galilee Panhandle since the end of Operation Accountability. The residents of the north are tensely following the events, and awaiting an IDF [Israel Defense Forces] reaction. [passage omitted]

Shell Possibly Fired by IDF

TA2209205393 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 1600 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] It now appears that the bomb that landed in the Qiryat Shemona area after noon today was not a katyusha rocket but a mortar shell. Our correspondent Yo'av Aviv reports that the IDF [Israel Defense Forces] is investigating whether the shell was fired by a hostile element beyond the border, or mistakenly by an IDF unit.

Meanwhile the Islamic Jihad organization in Beirut announced that its men fired a katyusha rocket toward northern Israel, but now it is clear that it was a mortar shell.

[Jerusalem Israel Television Network in Hebrew at 1900 GMT on 22 September in its report on the incident adds: "An IDF unit mistakenly fired a 120-mm mortar shell toward the Qiryat Shemona area at noon today. Our correspondent in the north Moti 'Eden reports that the shell fell several hundred meters away from the houses in the south of the city. There were no casualties and no damage was caused. The IDF Northern Command is currently investigating the circumstances of the incident."]

IDF 'Forcibly' Evicting Settlers in Bet El

TA2309072993 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 0700 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Text] The IDF [Israel Defense Forces] is forcibly evicting dozens of settlers from a site near Bet El. Male soldiers are evicting the men, while female soldiers are evicting the women. Our correspondent Aviv Bushinsky reports that

dozens of settlers arrived at the site this morning with bulldozers to fence in state-owned land and to pave roads. The IDF had earlier warned the settlers to leave the area or be evicted by force. Settlers are also fencing in state-owned land near Qiryat Arba'.

Rabin Promises To Consult Settlers on Interim Status

TA2209163993 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 1600 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] When conducting talks on the interim arrangement, the defense establishment will consult settlers residing in Judaea, Samaria, and the Gaza Strip on every issue pertaining to their status and security. An agreement to this effect was reached in a meeting between the heads of Meymad [religious movement established by Rabbi Yehuda 'Amital in 1988] and the prime minister.

In the meeting, Yitzhaq Rabin again explained that there was no plan to harm the existing settlements during the interim arrangement period, and that the settlements' precise boundaries would be determined in negotiations.

The prime minister pointed out that he adhered to his stand rejecting the establishment of a Palestinian state between Israel and Jordan. He added that the nature of the Palestinian entity would be determined in negotiations in due time.

Settlers Demand 'Territorial Continuity'

TA2209173093 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 1700 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] Deputy Defense Minister Mordekhay Gur has informed members of kibbutzim in the northern Dead Sea area that in no situation would an Israeli settlement be surrounded by autonomy lands in the Jericho area. The IDF [Israel Defense Forces] will be in full control of the situation, and no Arab body will intervene in the management of the settlements. He added that the local settlements' status will remain unchanged and Israel will not abandon the location during the five years of autonomy.

Our correspondent Shulamit Schmerling reports that at the meeting between Deputy Minister Gur and representatives of the northern Dead Sea area kibbutzim, the latter demanded that the new arrangement assure territorial continuity from 'En Gedi to Bet She'an.

Councils Propose Settlement Areas in Judaea, Samaria

TA2209153293 Tel Aviv IDF Radio in Hebrew 0600 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] The heads of several local councils in Judaea and Samaria have formulated a proposal that would enable them to swallow the autonomy plan when the permanent arrangement is enforced. They propose to establish three large pockets of Jewish settlements in Greater Jerusalem, in Mevo Dan [the Dan District approaches], and in the Jordan Valley that would be under absolute Israeli sovereignty and in which the autonomy authorities would have no powers whatsoever. Our correspondent in the territories Golan Yokhpaz reports on the details:

The plan has been laying around for a long time. As its authors see it, it would solve the problems in the territories when the Israeli-Palestinian permanent arrangement is enforced. They believe a Palestinian autonomy will ultimately be established in the territories and, that being the case, they want to make the most of this bad bargain.

The plan envisages the establishment of three large pockets of Jewish settlements in three areas: Greater Jerusalem, Mevo Dan, and the Jordan Valley. The plan provides for absolute Israeli sovereignty in those pockets, in which the authorities of the Palestinian autonomy would have no powers whatsoever. We want to create a large territorial contiguity between the settlements in Judaea and Samaria and link them to main roads which would not cross through the Palestinian autonomy regions, thus averting unnecessary friction between the Palestinians and the settlers. The authors envisage a bloc of Jewish settlements that would, among other things, serve as a security buffer.

The heads of local councils in the 'Etzyon Bloc, Efrat, Ma'ale Adumim, and other locations in Judaea and Samaria submitted the plan to Labor and SHAS [Torah Observing Sephardim] Knesset members, who earlier this week promised to examine the idea and give them a reply.

However, it seems the authors of the plan will have to surmount numerous difficulties on the way to its enforcement. For example, how to solve the problem of Bethlehem, which might become a thorn in the side of the Great Jerusalem pocket? Or how to solve the problem of settlers in Qiryat Arba', who will refuse to give in to the Israeli-Palestinian agreement? In the meantime, the heads of the local councils say, they will keep demonstrating across from the Knesset building to bring about a referendum.

IDF Commander, Deputy Defense Minister on Deployment

TA2309073393 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 0600 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Text] Major General Nehemya Tamari, commander of the Central Command, has been meeting with security officers of kibbutzim in the northern part of the Dead Sea to discuss the anticipated deployment of the IDF [Israel Defense Forces] upon the establishment of the Palestinian autonomy in Jericho. Tamari expounded on the IDF's conception of the security arrangements and the ways to secure the cultivated areas of the kibbutzim. In their ongoing sessions, they will also discuss the possibility of exchanging plots of land, because some kibbutzim in the area own cultivated areas inside Jericho. They will also discuss ways to impart a sense of security to thousands of tourists who visit the northern Dead Sea.

The deputy defense minister foresees joint patrols by the IDF and the Palestinians along the access road to Jericho upon the establishment of the autonomy. In a meeting with

representatives of kibbutzim in the northern part of the Dead Sea, Mordekhay Gur said that Israel does not want even to hint at abandoning settlements. Nevertheless, he said, he could make no commitments regarding the permanent arrangement.

Our correspondent Shulamit Schmerling points out that the kibbutz members voiced their anxiety over the agreement. Among other things, they pointed out that their drinking and irrigation water comes from Jericho. Deputy Minister Gur replied that Israel is drafting position papers concerning the water.

Fatah 'Terrorists' Apprehended in Gaza Strip 22 Sep

TA2209194893 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Hebrew 1800 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] A Border Police patrol apprehended five Fatah terrorists armed with pistols and grenades in the Jabalyah refugee camp in the Gaza Strip this evening. The patrolmen spotted a suspicious vehicle on the outskirts of the camp, alerted more forces, surrounded the vehicle, and overcame the terrorists. It transpired that three of the five have been on the wanted list for a long time.

PLO Economic Committee Official Arrives on Visit

JN2309102493 Amman AL-DUSTUR in Arabic 23 Sep 93 p 30

[Text] Amman—The Security and Border Committee and the Economy Committee, affiliated with the Joint Jordanian-Palestinian Higher Committee, will resume their sessions in Amman on Saturday [25 Sep].

Ahmad Quray', alias Abu-'Ala, head of the PLO's Economy Department, arrived in Amman the day before yesterday on a visit to Jordan, during which he may attend the meetings of the Economy Committee.

Abu-'Ala was one of the most prominent members of the Palestinian delegation that held secret talks with Israeli officials in the Norwegian capital, Oslo, which were crowned by the Palestinian-Israeli agreement, signed at the White House on 13 September.

Minister Details Passenger Traffic Across Bridges

JN2209180893 Amman Radio Jordan Network in Arabic 1100 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] Led by His Majesty King Husayn, Jordan's consistent policy has been to firm up the Palestinian people on their national soil and uphold the national Palestinian identity. This remark was made by Interior Minister Salamah Hammad to the JORDANIAN NEWS AGENCY today while inspecting services offered to travellers to and from the West Bank and the Gaza Strip across the bridges.

According to the minister, a combination of factors has contributed to an increase in the number of arrivals from the occupied Palestinian territory. He listed these as the closure of the occupied Palestinian territory, open permits issued for those who are 25 years and older, slashed exit fees, and other measures, plus straitened circumstances.

The number of citizens who crossed from the occupied Palestinian territory from June to 20 September, 1993, was 226,465, whereas in August alone, the minister indicated, 97,452 citizens arrived. He gave the number of the Palestinian citizens who left Jordan for the West Bank and Gaza Strip as 228,052.

The minister said the measures taken at the bridges were in implementation of instructions to check emigration prompted by occupation authorities. There are 105,000 jobless Palestinians whom he said Israel has been coaxing to leave their homeland in pursuit of employment.

We are doing all we can to alleviate the inconvenience experienced by our kinsfolk by providing the necessary facilities and cutting time-consuming red tape. The minister cited the building of a well-equipped hall with a seating capacity for 1,000 travellers.

Meanwhile, the minister has met with the assistant director general of judicial police and the bridges security chief. The two briefed the minister on the status of services offered for travellers across the bridges. The minister also interviewed Palestinians transiting the bridges to learn about their grievances.

Information Minister on Israeli Journalists' Entry

JN2109151293 Amman AL-DUSTUR in Arabic 20 Sep 93 p 30

[By Amjad Mu'alla]

[Excerpt] Information Minister Ma'n Abu-Nuwar has said some Israeli journalists entered Jordan in a twisted and illegal way, using passports issued by foreign countries. He called this an Israeli below-the-belt strike to the peace process. He called on Israeli journalists to refrain from further such entries, so they do not harm the peace process.

In statements to AL-DUSTUR, Abu-Nuwar said it has been recently noticed that some foreign journalists, who carry U.S., German, British, or Italian passports—and a dual nationality from their native country and Israel—are entering Jordan under the claim that they are journalists. Then, they start interfering in state agencies to obtain press statements from officials.

Asked about what prompted the Ministry of Information to issue a circular instructing ministries to examine the identity cards of foreign journalists when they meet them, Abu-Nuwar went on to say: At this stage and in this climate, which is conducive to peace, we do not want such bad behavior. We expect Israeli journalists not to embark on such unclean acts.

He called on Israeli journalists to be patient to see what the future holds in store. Abu-Nuwar expressed his belief that when peace is achieved, these journalists will be able to enter Jordan just like other foreign journalists, and talk freely. He added: However, before peace is achieved, I believe such acts are a hit below the belt, which the Israelis are expected to stop as soon as possible in order not to harm the peace process.

Regarding the television reports from Amman recently aired by Israeli Television, the minister indicated that two correspondents of Israeli Television had entered Jordan using U.S. and French passports. They stayed in the country for two days. But when we realized that they are correspondents of Israeli Television, we asked the embassies of the countries whose passports they are bearing to ensure the departure of these two correspondents from Jordanian territory, the minister noted.

Abu-Nuwar affirmed that this was achieved amicably.

In reply to a question on whether Jordanian ministries intend to invite foreign journalists to Jordan to reorganize the distribution of information in periodic news conferences by the Ministry of Information and other competent ministries, particularly in light of these violations, the minister said: There are no grounds for fears that foreign journalists can enter Jordan as tourists. This is because the Jordan News Agency, the foreign journalists stationed in

Jordan, and foreign news agencies receive all the information at our disposal. We do not withhold any piece of information from any press agency.

The information minister added: I have gone further than this by giving my home telephone number to all journalists. I would like to see this telephone number published in the newspaper AL-DUSTUR so each and every journalist can learn of it. It is as follows: 812335. You, as well as any of your colleagues, may contact me any time so that I may answer any question.

The information minister denied that the Jordanian people are concerned about peaceful solutions and recent political developments in the region. He said the Jordanian people are well aware that their government is a democratic government, that the system of government espoused in this country is democratic, and that the king bestowed on us by God is a compassionate democrat.

The minister added: Thus, we have no concerns. There might be some concern about the economic state of affairs. But I would like to say that in Jordan, we have gone through the worst problems. We have emerged unscathed, with our honor and dignity intact. The Jordanian people follow events on more than 30 local and foreign radio and television stations. All of these stations broadcast news on what is taking place in the region. So, there is no need for concern. [passage omitted]

Minister Denies Husayn Warning of Yom Kippur Attack

JN2109165793 Jerusalem Qol Yisra'el in Arabic 1530 GMT 21 Sep 93

[Text] Jordanian Information Minister Ma'n Abu-Nuwar today categorically denied statements by (Elie Za'era), former Israeli intelligence chief, to the effect that King Husayn warned Israel of an imminent Arab attack against it on the eve of the Yom Kippur War. In statements to AFP, Abu-Nuwar said this news report is unfounded.

Islamic Front Official Views Elections, Gaza-Jericho

JN2209175193 Amman AL-DUSTUR in Arabic 22 Sep 93 p 3

[Interview with Dr. Ishaq al-Farhan, secretary general of the Islamic Action Front, IAF, by Nayif al-Muhaysin; place and date not given]

[Excerpts] [Al-Muhaysin] Would you provide us with an idea on the basis on which the IAF candidates were selected?

[Al-Farhan] The answer to this question is that a group of former deputies were considered. New candidates who are efficient in parliamentary performance were also considered. Integration between efficiencies and specializations was also considered, as well as the chances of success in various constituencies. Finally, a comprehensive vision concerning the realization of the party's political and social objectives in accordance with the party's program was considered. The door will remain open for some limited additions or withdrawals, in light of the election process.

[Al-Muhaysin] What percentage of success do you expect for your candidates?

[Al-Farhan] We hope to win the largest precentage possible. We expect the number to be larger than in the past. We expect 25-30 IAF candidates to win. [passage omitted]

[Al-Muhaysin] Do you think there is a need to delay the parliamentary elections in light of the current developments?

[Al-Farhan] The elections are scheduled to be held in one and a half months. I do not expect any major extraordinary development to require a delay of the elections, although the Gaza-Jericho agreement has negative reflections on the region, including Jordan. This requires a study of these reflections on any political plan, including the elections. But I think that in the short run, there will be no effects resulting from this agreement, which will run into a three-year transitional stage. It is illogical to delay the elections for years because this will undermine the democratic march. Therefore, I think the solution is to hold elections as scheduled, or to reinstate the dissolved parliament to practice its legislative and monitoring role until new elections are held. But it is illogical and unacceptable to leave the country in a parliamentary and constitutional vacuum. [passage omitted]

[Al-Muhaysin] There are reports about coordination between the Fatah Movement and the Hamas Movement. What is your opinion about such coordination after the Palestinian-Israeli agreement?

[Al-Farhan] We believe that one of the most serious results of Gaza-Jericho agreement is friction between supporters and opponents of the agreement inside Palestine. Therefore, any agreement in the occupied territories to avoid shedding Palestinian blood anywhere other than in the confrontation with the Israeli enemy is something we encourage. It is a topmost priority to preserve the unity of the ranks. As for political agreements, I think there is no room for compromise between the two parties except within the framework of implementing real democracy in administering the self-rule that represents all parties and allows other opinions to be expressed without military repression.

Mu'tah Trial: First Prosecution Witness Heard

JN2109070193 Amman JORDAN TIMES in English 21 Sep p 10

["Special to the JORDAN TIMES" by Sana' 'Atiyah]

[Text] Marka—The State Security Court Monday heard the first prosecution witness in the Mu'tah University case, in which 10 defendants are accused of conspiring to assassinate His Majesty King Husayn.

The witness, a student at Mu'tah University, a military academy south of Amman, testified that five Mu'tah

students among the accused were members of an Islamic group which was plotting to shoot the King at a graduation ceremony.

The witness stood facing the panel of three military judges with his back to the eight defendants.

Two of the accused are tried in absentia.

No names could be mentioned in media reports of the case.

After the witness testified, Prosecutor Major Muhannad Hijazi said that his testimony was incomplete in relation to the testimony he made in August to the Prosecution. After repeated objections from the defence, which tried to discredit the witness asserting that his testimony was incomplete because it was based on lies, the court clerk read out the testimony he had made earlier to the prosecution.

Presiding Judge Colonel Hafiz Amin asked the witness if that first testimony was true, and the witness replied, "definitely, I have sworn on the Koran."

A brother of one of the defendants, who was also detained in the same case but later released, cried out against the witness that he was lying because "a two-metre tall armed military police is standing behind him, and you expect him to tell the truth?"

Col. Amin asked the military police to remove the brother from the courtroom, and the rest of his family followed him as the women shouted, "he (witness) was told exactly what to say, but he could not memorise the whole story."

After the outburst, the defence insisted that the court register a comment the witness made: "Why should you bother me. I'm incharge of a family and I want to live." The defence was apparently trying to establish that the witness was under duress from the security authorities, while the witness was trying to say he refused to be threatened by the public in the courtroom.

The defence also objected to another comment the witness made confidently to lawyers: "You are taking advantage of what I'm saying to your benefit. Are you going to do this to the eight witnesses who will testify to the same thing?"

In addition to charges of conspiring to kill the Monarch, the defendants are also accused of plotting to replace the regime with an Islamic caliphate state, changing the Constitution through "illegal and violent" means, and belonging to an illegal group, the Islamic Liberation Party (ILP).

In April and May, over 30 people were detained at the General Intelligence Department (GID) related to the case, but most were released last month. Two senior members of the ILP are still in detention. According to lawyers, 30 alleged members of the Islamic Party were arrested last week and are in detention. But this could not be officially confirmed on Monday. The ILP has categorically denied any involvement in the plot to assassinate the King.

The 20-year-old witness delivered a long statement in court Monday, with details on how he allegedly discovered that some of the students were planning to shoot the King, and that they belonged to an Islamic group. His testimony named some of the defendants, who listened quietly as they shook their heads, while others grinned and whispered to each other. They began to scribble notes on paper supplied by their lawyers.

The unmarried witness testified that as soon as one of the defendants told him of the plot and tried to recruit him to an unnamed Islamic group last February, he took the information to GID after recommendations from a relative and the dean of a faculty at the university.

"The GID called me and asked me to stick close to these students, and not to share the information with any other department," the witness said, adding that he began to learn more about who was involved in the alleged plot and continued to brief the GID on new findings.

He continued that when one of the defendants who was supposed to kill the King left the group, he told them "I was ready to shoot him myself."

"All my directives were from the GID, but it was my own initiative when I suggested I do the shooting myself," the witness said, responding to a specific question by Col. Amin after the defence insisted that the court clerk record that the witness was taking orders from the GID.

Before cross-examining the witness, lawyer Jawad Yunis objected to the testimony, saying that he and some of the defendants had their differences.

"The witness represents an element of investigation in commiting crimes which are directed by the GID apparatus," Mr. Yunis told the court. "He could not memorise his testimony."

The lawyer asked the court to detain the witness "for placing doubts on the honour of this court by claiming that it did not give him the chance to give his full testimony."

Maj. Hijazi described the defence request to detain the witness as "threats against the witness," adding that the man in the witness stand had come under threats from inside the courtroom and outside.

"It is not true that the witness was detained at the GID, and the defence should give details on what the differences are between the witness and the defendants," Maj. Hijazi said before the presiding judge rejected the defence motion.

The witness, who kept a straight face but bit his nails, came under tough cross-examination. The defence tried to discredit the witness and tried to establish that he had been detained at the GID and that he gave his incriminating testimony under duress.

The cadet kept insisting that he went to the GID voluntarily, but after persistent questioning by Mr. Yunis, he admitted that he had gone to the intelligence department seven to 10 times after the arrests took place, and that he stayed there for half an hour each time.

But after re-examination by the prosecution, the witness said he went to the GID seven to 10 times between February and the time of the defendants' detention.

Despite the defence's attempts to establish that he was beaten at the GID, the witness insisted he was "not hit and I did not have a cut on my forehead. I was relaxed and doing my duty."

But he revealed that he spent three days in a GID prison with one of the defendants "to try to get more information from him on orders from" a GID officer.

After the cross-examination, Maj Hijazi read out a report written by the witness where he claimed that he was harrassed by relatives and lawyers of the defendants. The prosecutor said that the witness claimed that they tried to make him sign a new testimony prepared by the lawyers.

"This is a total fabrication," Mr. Yunis said angrily. "I resent the prosecution coming up with something like this in front of the public."

The judge refused to look into the allegations, saying the State Security Court was not the specialised body to look into such claims. he adjourned the court until Saturday when prosecution witnesses will testify.

Al-Hariri Cited on PLO Accord, Reconstruction

NC2209134093 Beirut Radio Lebanon in Arabic 1030 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Statement by Milhim Karam, head of the Editors Association, following his meeting with Prime Minister Rafiq al-Hariri in Beirut on 22 September—recorded]

[Excerpts] The meeting with Prime Minister Rafiq al-Hariri was a time for us to discuss hot issues. The prime minister believes peace is not a gift but represents the interests of great powers, which have decided peace is inevitable and is in their interest. There should be no miscalculations or illusions.

Prime Minister al-Hariri believes the Gaza-Jericho agreement is a Palestinian affair. The Palestinians told us nothing in advance. Had they coordinated with us, they would have obtained better results. This agreement has prompted us to plan for steadfastness and perseverance in the post-peace era. This plan still exists. We are immunizing ourselves against anything that might afflict Lebanon.

On the agreement's outcome and its impact on Lebanon, especially on its reconstruction and the $2 billion allocated to it, Prime Minister al-Hariri said there was no decision on this amount. It remains under discussion. The agreement did not stop the amount being allocated. It was not something that was decided. If it had been, we would have obtained it and enjoyed it. [passage omitted]

On relations with the United States, Prime Minister al-Hariri said it is neither against us nor with us. We will discuss the ban on Americans traveling on Middle East Airlines during our meetings with U.S. officials. We will learn what they want and how to conduct transactions with them.

The prime minister said there are people in Lebanon who do not want a state there and who are working toward this end with all their resources. Dialogue with them continues because we are open to all, even to those who do not want to open to us. [passage omitted]

Al-Hariri said the government will not be reshuffled. The government will remain as it is with the same people. Any talk about this issue is out of place, he concluded. [passage omitted]

Al-Hirawi, al-Asad Discuss Regional Situation

NC2309110093 Beirut Radio Lebanon in Arabic 1030 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Text] A telephone conversation took place between President Ilyas al-Hirawi and Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad at noon today. During the call, the two leaders discussed the situation in the region. They also touched on the outcome of the talks President al-Asad had with Egyptian President Husni Mubarak in Alexandria, during which he reiterated Syria's clear stance on the peace process within the framework of the implementation of the UN resolutions.

Islamic Group Claims Responsibility for Firing Katyusha

NC2209171393 Beirut Voice of Lebanon in Arabic 1615 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] According to our correspondent in Tyre, the Islamic Jihad Organization-Lebanon's Cells [Munazzamat al-Jihad al-Islami-Khalaya Lubnan] this afternoon claimed responsibility for firing a Katyusha missile on Israel.

But UN Interim Force in Lebanon sources told our correspondent that the reports they had received did not mention that any missile was fired from south Lebanon.

Lebanese Army sources also denied that Katyushas were fired from the south.

Resistance Claims Attacks on Lahd Militia 22 Sep

NC2309073393 Ba'labakk Voice of the Oppressed in Arabic 0530 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Text] The Islamic resistance waged a series of operations against the positions of Lahdist agents in Haddathah, Haris, and Bra'shit last night. According to a statement by the Islamic Resistance, the attacks, in which machine guns and rockets were used, left several of the enemy personnel killed or wounded.

Sources in the Lahdist militia admitted that four Lahdist agents were seriously wounded in an attack by the heroes of the Islamic resistance last night.

Further Attack 23 Sep

NC2309111093 Beirut Radio Lebanon in Arabic 1030 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Text] A resistance group attacked a patrol of agent Lahd on the Tuhrah road this morning, killing two agents and wounding two others. Shortly afterwards, Israeli occupation forces raked the scene of the operation.

AL-AKHBAR Interviews President al-Asad

NC2209152093 Cairo AL-AKHBAR in Arabic 20 Sep 93 pp 4, 5, and 9

[First part of a two-part interview with President Hafiz al-Asad in Damascus by Ibrahim Sa'dah, chairman of the board of AL-AKHBAR; date not given]

[Text] [Sa'dah] In his interview last week with PARIS MATCH magazine, [Israeli Foreign Minister] Shim'on Peres said that the talks with the Palestinians began before eight months ago and were held in secret. Mr. President, when did you learn about these talks? Were they unknown to you, as has been reported?

[Al-Asad] 'Arafat did not inform us of his secret contacts, and we did not receive any information from him about these contacts. He says that the talks began around the end of last year, and yet he kept quiet about them. When I met him in Damascus, I told him that it would have been normal and assumed that you would have told the people, especially those with whom you pretended to coordinate and whose meetings you attended.

We heard many rumors about secret contacts held by 'Arafat and his aides with Israel. But there are many rumors; some of them are true and others are half true, if this is the right expression. Some of these rumors become facts by coincidence. We have experienced this situation for many years. Therefore, one does not pay much attention to this matter. The other thing is that, since the peace process began between the concerned countries that went to Madrid and then to Washington, it was envisaged that there would be some sort of continued coordination, particularly as there is good collective coordination. Since the Arab-Israeli conflict began, I do not recall seeing the Arab countries involved better coordinated in this peaceful effort than they have been since the Madrid conference. There are a number of reasons for this, the most important of which is that the foreign ministers used to meet before and after every round to consult and coordinate in order to reach the best decisions. The ministers used to meet at least once a week to exchange information and coordinate action until the surprise that no one expected happened, the surprise of the secret talks and the Gaza-Jericho agreement.

Yes, it was a painful surprise, particularly as we know our brothers in the Palestinian revolution better than our other Arab brothers because of our joint daily coexistence. We know every detail about them and the disposition of every leader. I personally spend three-quarters of my time for them. We even used to delay handling urgent Syrian issues for reasons that concern them. I told them many times: You will not achieve anything without Arab backing [zakhm 'arabi]. They are supposed to know this. Much talk has taken place between us in the past years, and the objective of these talks was to make them realize this fact, especially as the Palestinian issue is the basis for everything. It is true that the Israeli aggression was not confined to Palestine alone but included other Arab countries, but Palestine was the beginning. Of course, we all realize the developments on this issue. I personally volunteered when I was 16 years old to be a fighter in Palestine. Of course, the government at that time could not take all the people because it did not possess even vehicles to transport them to fight in defense of Palestine. The youths speak about Palestine from their childhood. We are like them. But we did not expect what happened.

Second, there is no justification for these secret talks. I believe the Palestinians lost, the Arabs also lost, and only Israel won. No individual can be stronger than the group. There is no logic to support that; if there was, the outlook, even mathematically, would change. Israel must have made careful calculations and found it appropriate to seize the opportunity. Israel gives little to the party that acts on its own, and if it gives something today, it takes it back later, that is, if there is anything to be given. Israel is known to benefit from the policy of creating rifts.

Third, if some countries, due to restrictions imposed on them, do particular things, popular revolutions "pull up" [tufarmil]; they must not run. What happened is regrettable; no one expected it.

[Sa'dah] 'Arafat said he met you, described the meeting as positive, and said he thanked you for your advice. He said President al-Asad stated some objections, but did not reveal them. Do I understand from what you have said, Mr. President, that these are your objections?

[Al-Asad] Of course not. What I mentioned were only objections to the form, although the word form does not precisely apply here, because the form and the content are intermingled. There are many objections, but, in principle, we will not change our position toward the Palestinian cause. It is the cause of all the Arabs—Egypt, Syria, and the others. Otherwise, there would have been no justification for all the sacrifices we made, no justification for all the deaths for the sake of Palestine, and no justification for our mobilizing our economy for 40 or 50 years to serve the Palestinian cause. I am discussing my sentiments as an Arab citizen, rather than as an official. For us, Palestine is just like Syria or any other part of Bilad al-Sham [Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, and Palestine].

[Sa'dah] Can the Gaza-Jericho agreement pose any direct or indirect threat to Syria or Jordan? Why did King Husayn come to Syria as soon as the agreement was signed?

[Al-Asad] As for threats, I say the agreement constitutes no threat. But as you know, we disagreed with President al-Sadat when he moved unilaterally, although he and I planned the October war, which, by all standards, was a major achievement for the Arabs. Perhaps you recall the image of the Arabs before and after the war. It is true that as leaders, we were raising Arab morale before the war, especially as our nation suffered repeated defeats and its spirits, naturally, were low. We were engaged in long planning before we waged the war. We made mistakes in the war; I wished President al-Sadat was there to discuss many things, frankly. We discussed things, and we disagreed, but we would coordinate again because we realized

the importance of collective work. This is natural: Collective work is better and more productive than individual work. 'Arafat cannot be like al-Sadat. Al-Sadat was president of Egypt, which is a big country. 'Arafat was hasty and should have limited the damage better.

The Gaza-Jericho agreement can pose no threat to us. But, as I said, we were engaged in effective coordination, but this has now been crushed to the benefit, of course, of a party alien to the Arab world.

We have been seeking a comprehensive solution for 20 years. If we had been searching for a solution to the Golan problem only, we would have had chances. But we rejected anything that failed to achieve a comprehensive solution. Neither I nor the Syrian people was prepared to accept a partial solution. But, and considering the circumstances, we officially announced Syria's continuing support for the rights of the fraternal Palestinian people. We said they and their institutions have the right to decide what they find appropriate. Had we wanted to hinder the agreement, we would have foiled it. But, frankly, the agreement caused more damage in the Palestinian arena. Certainly, if it becomes clear to us that the damage caused by the agreement will be great, we will do something. But in light of what we see and expect, the damage will be less than any that is caused by problems among people and fighting. We will see if there are major difficulties or not. Anyway, you read the agreement, and I read it. I don't know to what they agreed. Each point in the agreement needs an agreement. What happened is a step on a long road. So, we said the Palestinians have the right to approve what they deem appropriate. This is not my principle or that of Syria. It is the responsibility of all the Arabs; you can't tell someone who sacrificed everything for Palestine that he is a stranger to this cause.

[Sa'dah] Some have commented on the remark that "Syria accepts whatever the Palestinian people accept" as support for the agreement.

[Al-Asad] In fact, we were absolutely clear. We did not bless, and we did not support. We did not oppose, and we did not accept. I advised the brothers. 'Arafat said that he had thanked me for the advice. I only told him to unite the people, unite the citizens so that there will be no massacres. I told him that we will not obstruct anything. Therefore, he said thank you three times.

[Sa'dah] This means that you agree with the media and political circles' analysis that President al-Asad neither agreed with nor opposed the agreement?

[Al-Asad] Yes. That is correct.

[Sa'dah] But there are those who say that 'Arafat's visit to Damascus gave him a big boost.

[Al-Asad] Of course, the meeting itself gave him a boost because receiving 'Arafat in Damascus was undoubtedly undesirable. Neutrality in this issue is also unacceptable. [as published]

[Sa'dah] It is certain, Mr. President, that there is no peace without Syria, no peace without Lebanon, no peace without Jordan, and no peace without Palestine. The first real step toward peace, in fact, started with the Palestinians and then with the Jordanians. Mr. President, when do you expect the first step toward peace with Syria and Lebanon to start?

[Al-Asad] Of course, the negotiations we began more than two years ago are supposed to continue because no one has said that he does not want to continue with them, and we have not said that we do not want to continue with them.

[Sa'dah] We are demanding comprehensive peace for all the Arab parties. When the Palestinians agree with Israel and then with Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria, is this not in the end a comprehensive peace?

[Al-Asad] Israel is trying to pick us off one by one. This cannot be with good intentions, we would be naive and simple to think so, because whoever wants real peace cannot seek to pick others off one by one. When you fight four persons and then want to make peace with them, what is the justification for your insistence on making peace with each one of the four separately? Israel's objective is to show that the Arab countries are divided so that it can impose its will. At any rate, when Syria signs any peace agreement it will have fulfilled its commitments toward peace because there will be no one fighting alone.

(After remaining silent for a moment, President al-Asad continued.) You are asking about the meeting with King Husayn here in Damascus. In fact, King Husayn has said that he will not sign a peace agreement until the end [agreements are reached on all tracks], even though Jordan's problems with Israel are limited. King Husayn was surprised by the Gaza-Jericho agreement and said he did not know what happened. He was surprised because he was supposed to know more than anyone else because there are joint committees between his country and the Palestinians. The discussions with King Husayn were held within this context. King Husayn expressed his dissatisfaction with the agreement because the talks were kept a secret from him. That is what he said. A statement was issued after the talks in which we stressed that we discussed the Palestinian agreement, which was a surprise to Arab countries and had not been coordinated with them.

[Sa'dah] In return, Mr. President, what has prompted Israel to go along with this step? Does it intend, for example, to show the lack of agreement among the Arabs?

[Al-Asad] As everyone knows, Israel is not comfortable in Gaza. It is facing difficulties that are not easy to deal with. Evidence that confirms this is no secret to anyone. Israel has an interest in having the Arabs share in shouldering the burden it is bearing. The agreement achieves this objective for Israel. Still, I hope that this agreement will achieve more than one deduces when one reads it because the agreement leaves everything in Israel's hands. The agreement has not given anything. Of course, 'Arafat has to accept anything but he has put himself in a big prison.

[Sa'dah] Mr. President, you received two telephone calls from U.S. President Bill Clinton in less than one week after the signing of the Gaza-Jericho agreement. Is it possible to know the most important points you talked about? How true are the reports that President Clinton has told Syria that his country will continue its role as a full partner? Is the United States still exercising its role as a partner or has the arena become open for Israel to exercise the policy of fait accompli?

[Al-Asad] The expression full partner can be explained in several ways. What we in fact hear from them—this happened when Warren Christopher came to the region for the first and second times and also during the contacts with President Clinton—underlines their commitment to achieve peace on the basis of the initiative that guarantees land in return for peace. Anyway, President Clinton stressed in the two calls "the U.S. desire to continue its efforts to help make the peace process successful and its commitment to work for progress on all tracks in the peace process." U.S. officials are always stressing these meanings in various ways. The recent contacts with them were held within this context.

The U.S. Administration is, of course, a new one. Therefore, meetings with the administration were limited. In light of what those limited meetings allow one to infer, we can say that it has the desire to back the peace process. The United States has started to see that its role must have practical and tangible results that save the peace process from stagnation and deadlock. It is certain that the United States has found that its initiative based on "the return of land in return for peace" was subjected to rejection and attraction, especially as the Israeli side repeatedly tried to bypass this principle and circumvent it through maneuvering, deception, and provocation.

To what extent can the United States escalate its role and "activate" the peace process? It is difficult to speculate on this. The results will judge this role's "effectiveness" or "non-effectiveness." Of course, we cannot so far let the U.S. Administration's words or even its practice make us doubt its intentions.

Of course, it is possible that Israel can impede things at times and can exert pressure on the United States and Syria. It is stressing its willingness to cooperate to ensure the success of the peace process and its commitment to achieve a just and comprehensive peace and is asking everyone to shoulder their historic responsibilities. We adhere to the principles of a just and comprehensive solution through our desire that the peace process lead to the agreed on objectives. A just and comprehensive peace alone ensures the success and continuation of peace away from the policy of fait accompli and the resulting jolts and injustice, as Israel is seeking to inflict by proposing plans for partial solutions, unilateral deals, and limited withdrawals.

[Sa'dah] What do you think are the main reasons that prompted Yasir 'Arafat to enter into secret, protracted talks with the Israelis, although peace negotiations in which Syria, Lebanon, and Jordan are participating are continuing in Washington?

[Al-Asad] Perhaps he thought he would win more using this method than he would the other way.

[Sa'dah] Win? Personally or in terms of the [Palestinian] cause?

[Al-Asad] (the Syrian president laughs) Yasir 'Arafat does not distinguish between himself and the Palestinian cause. Of course, it was known that Israel wanted to rid itself of Gaza at any cost. It looked for someone who would take it. He ['Arafat] heard about this and strived for it, hence the Gaza-Jericho accord came about. What kind of policy is it that is built on talk in the air?

[Sa'dah] We have heard that Palestinian factions opposed to the accord opposed your meeting 'Arafat. What is the truth?

[Al-Asad] Naturally, they expected Syria to refuse to receive 'Arafat. 'Arafat asked to meet them, but they refused. So, I say that when the West or Israel ask us to silence them, we say Israel should silence the Likud.

[Sa'dah] Yasir 'Arafat said he could unify the Palestinian fold, while some believe the conflict might turn from a Palestinian- Israeli to a Palestinian-Palestinian one.

[Al-Asad] Some of the Palestinians say this. Today, I heard a statement from a Hamas [Islamic Resistance Movement] official in Amman, saying: "We don't want to resort to violence against the Palestinians, but we want to exercise our rights." There is a possibility of problems arising among them and the issue is not as simple as 'Arafat says.

[Sa'dah] Even if there were Syrian or Arab mediation?

[Al-Asad] Syrian mediation on this issue? It can't happen.

[Sa'dah] Rabin has unveiled an old history of Israeli-Moroccan contacts, which he said go back 20 years. He also said that King Hassan II comes from a family that harbors no hostility toward Israel. Were the Arab leaders unaware of these contacts or were these contacts taken into account when King Hassan was chosen chairman of the Jerusalem committee? And how do you interpret, Your Excellency the President, King Hassan's initiative to invite Rabin to visit Morocco immediately after the conclusion of the ceremony in which the Gaza-Jericho agreement was signed at the White House?

[Al-Asad] I have heard these statements in which they [not further specified] have said that since the Palestinians have shaken hands with Israel's leaders there is no longer any justification to maintain the feud. Anyway, the Arabs know about the Moroccan-Israeli contacts. We have all heard about them at various times. We have heard of visits and meetings with the Israelis in Morocco and in Israel. You remember that Syria at one time broke off relations with Morocco for this reason, and there were differences between Morocco and the Arab countries for the same reason. (President al-Asad paused for a while, then said in

a sad tone:) Of course the effect of these contacts is no more than a psychological one. At least one must show solidarity with his brother, even by feelings. If the situation was just that the Palestinian leaders shook hands with them and then went away, there would be no justification for the pain it caused, but the issue is not just a matter of 'Arafat or others shaking hands with Rabin or others. There are Arab countries whose lands are still occupied. There are millions of displaced persons, including Palestinians and Syrians. In Syria alone there are 500,000 displaced persons. In Lebanon there was murder and massacres, and the same was true in Jordan. It is true that the Israeli aggression started with Palestine, but it extended elsewhere: to Egypt, Syria, and parts of Jordan and Lebanon. This is what happened, unfortunately. Of course, we are not ignoring the situation in the world today and we are not distancing ourselves from the important developments that have taken place in the world, but we sincerely say that the Arab future will be very bad if it is subjected to imaginary considerations. There is no justification for any people to give up their values and principles. When they face dangers, they must search for ways to fulfill themselves so they do not give up their values and principles.

[Sa'dah] The Arab public would like to hear from you, Your Excellency the President; your expectations about the Palestinian-Israeli agreement in the near future and its effect on the just and comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute.

[Al-Asad] It is natural that unless peace occurs our suspicions about Israel will remain deep. We cannot proceed on the basis of its goodwill. Consequently, we could deduce much about what it seeks to achieve from this agreement and from distracting the Arabs with "children's toys," if we may call them that. But these are bloody toys that seek to jeopardize the peace process, destroy it, or prevent it from materializing by means of the policy of fait accompli, putting together contradictions, and proposing partial solutions, unilateral deals, or limited withdrawals. When the Arabs are distracted by the problems among them, Israel will be very comfortable. This is particularly so since Israel does not want peace except one that is very narrow, and in the end it will call it peace in exchange for peace. This is what is seeks. It it true that the Labor Party said better things than the Likud, but it did not say what is required of the justice on which the world has agreed, that each person must get what he is entitled to, and it did not say what the UN Charter states regarding the inadmissibility of occupying lands by force. The UN resolutions and laws are clear that the occupied lands must be returned to their owners. Israel is not moving in that direction and, consequently, it does not want peace.

[Sa'dah] Israeli rejectionists have made more violent threats than those made by the Palestinian rejectionists. Rabin has admitted that he finds it extremely difficult to obtain the approval of the majority in the Israeli Knesset. He did not rule out a public referendum, although he said new elections are unlikely. Is this merely a distribution of roles or is there a real Israeli rejection that threatens peace?

[Al-Asad] Certainly there are people who reject the agreement in Israel. The Likud Party, for instance, is rejecting it. When Shamir's government negotiated with the Arabs for several months before its fall, it was clear that it was hindering any serious steps toward peace. It raised the "peace-for-peace" slogan; that is, the Likud Party wanted peace under continued occupation. The statements and positions of the Likud Party leave no room for doubt that it opposes the agreement and peace in general.

There are real differences between the Labor Party and the Likud Party. I believe that the majority of Israelis support the Israeli-Palestinian agreement, not because they all think in the same way but because this majority, to varying degrees, believes that the agreement is in Israel's interest. The Likud believes that the agreement does not fully realize Israel's interests, but the Labor Party believes the opposite.

[Sa'dah] But, Mr. President, they all avoid talking about Jerusalem, or they want the discussion of the subject to be delayed. When Rabin said that Jerusalem is Israel's "eternal capital," Yasir 'Arafat explained that Rabin was referring to the western sector of the city.

[Al-Asad] (Smiling) It seems that he has concluded a secret agreement over Jerusalem. 'Arafat is interpreting Rabin's statement as he likes, while Rabin, most likely, is unaware of 'Arafat's personal judgments. If there is a secret agreement on the subject meant by 'Arafat, then this is good.

[Sa'dah] The Israelis, Mr. President, have said nothing about 'Arafat's interpretation. They insist on keeping Jerusalem unified and the capital of Israel. The Palestinians, on the other hand, hope that the agreement will give them a chance in the future to make eastern Jerusalem the capital of a Palestinian state. How can this be achieved?

[Al-Asad] I believe that this problem is basically Palestinian. But, according to the norms of this world, there must exist a Palestinian entity now that the Palestinians have assumed control over their cause. Generally, the Arab states have legal and political difficulties in dealing with the issue of Jerusalem. But, irrespective of these difficulties, Jerusalem has a special status, and the Arabs must do something about it. A solution to the problem of Jerusalem must be found so that it will not remain a permanent problem.

[Sa'dah] Mr. President, I would like to ask you frankly about the obstacle that prevents some agreement between Syria and Israel. In other words, what comes first: Land then peace, or peace before land?

[Al-Asad] We hear and read about this in all countries. Those who listened to the statements of Muwaffaq al-'Allaf, the head of our delegation to the peace talks, certainly knew our position. We are continuing the peace process, we are eager to establish a just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East, and we are ready to cooperate to achieve this objective. But the peace Syria is hoping for is the one that gives everyone his rights and provides security and safety to all sides. Under no circumstances will Syria accept Israel's way of peace: control over both land and

peace. Syria is committed to Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. The resolutions contain enough to emphasize that those who hinder them are evading the requirements of peace.

The Americans and others said the paper Syria put forward at the peace talks was a historic document. This is our established and firm policy. Ibrahim, let me remind you that Syria opened the road to peace by accepting the U.S. initiative that regarded Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 as the basis for achieving a comprehensive and just regional peace. I said it before, and I say it again now that the opportunities for peace are better than before because of the international climate and the growing number of people seeking peace, even inside Israel.

The discussion that has been going on for two years now focuses on the phraseology of exchanging land for peace and withdrawal for peace. What should happen first—withdrawal or peace? I told the U.S. side: Complete withdrawal in exchange for a comprehensive peace. But Israel said nothing.

Syria repeatedly affirmed its continuing readiness to cooperate to make the peace process a success in light of its commitment to the principles of a just and comprehensive peace, because Syria is extremely eager that the peace process lead to its objectives through documents, commitments, and guarantees. The comprehensive solution guarantees the success and viability of the peace process and partial solutions and limited withdrawal cannot lead to a durable peace.

Anyway, Syria believes the terms of reference of peace constitute an integrated whole. The U.S. initiative calling for the return of peace in exchange for land was based on these terms of reference. Israel violated the conditions on which the Madrid conference was established and concentrated all its efforts on burying the initiative of land-for-peace.

Rabin claims Syria is hampering the peace process, but everyone knows that had it not been for Syria's consent to the Madrid conference and the U.S. initiative, the Washington negotiations would not have begun; they also know that Syria has a primary role in the peace process. Rabin may think Syria's clinging to its right hinders peace, but everyone knows Syria will not relinquish its national soil. Israel is responsible for the lack of positive progress in the peace talks; it is also responsible for talks stagnating and moving in an empty circle. It deceives and does not respond to the withdrawal provision included in the Syrian document in the sixth round.

This provision was discussed until the 11th round. Clearly, Israel's failure to give up the Golan and withdraw completely from the occupied Syrian Arab territories within the context of a just and comprehensive peace in the region indicates that it wants to impose a policy of a fait accompli and make the Arabs surrender to its hostile plans and accept partial solutions, separate deals, and phased settlements.

Israel's goals are no secret to anyone. It knows before anyone else that peace is impossible under the continuing occupation, that peace does not come in installments, and that the Washington talks will not achieve their goals and will not be saved without referring to Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. The U.S. initiative founded on the principle of exchanging land for peace relied on these resolutions.

The paper of principles on the basis of which the talks proceeded has been mixed up. They call the Palestinian-Israeli declaration the Middle East agreement or the Middle East peace. In the declaration, we hear of principles, but according to my information they are unclear and unspecified, as well as insufficient.

For example, we don't know how the police will conduct their duty; the language used in the agreement is not very clear. Elsewhere, you see the nomenclature "agenda," while this agenda is placed at the end of the accord. As for us, we have laid down clear, definitive principles; you see Israel dodging and maneuvering to evade these principles.

[Sa'dah] Could Israel say it does not object to withdrawal from territories in the Golan, rather than all the Golan, as it did with Resolution 242, and waste time arguing, as it did with its interpretation of Resolution 242?

[Al-Asad] The French version clearly says from all the territories. There is no ambiguity about the definite article in the other languages, such as the Spanish and Chinese. The fundamental basis of the resolution decides the issue. This fundamental basis says others' land cannot be seized by force. Hence, the issue is decided. It is, before anything else, up to the one who has the right. Could he relinquish his right or not? The Israelis now know they have no hope of Syria relinquishing an inch of its territory. The United States knows this very well and knew it before the Madrid conference. They know: Peace is not a question of buying or selling; it will never be at the expense of the territory. They know we agreed to the U.S. peace initiative because it is compatible with the UN resolutions. In all the discussions between us and the U.S. Administration, it stressed that the U.S. initiative is based on Resolutions 242 and 338. Israel—as I said—knows this. When it says anything less, it knows that it is rejected. I have said before that Syria will not relinquish an inch of the Golan, that a compromise on territory is out of the question, and that peace cannot be established at the expense of others' territory.

[Sa'dah] Mr. President, do you expect to see a solution this year, as the assistant U.S. secretary of state has said?

[Al-Asad] This could be achieved if Israel accepts the Security Council resolutions. But what we are seeing does not herald the possibility of achieving it. There might have been some signs earlier. Of course, some cite the conditions in Israel as the reason, most notably the opposition's relations with the government. But, as I said and since we are enemies, it is natural to be cautious.

[Sa'dah] Syria has always been the first to assist the Arab countries and help them to defend their security and

borders. This happened recently during the Gulf crisis, when Syrian and Egyptian forces went to defend the Gulf. My question is: Will Syria agree to participate in achieving security in Jericho and the Gaza Strip if 'Arafat asks?

[Al-Asad] (smiling) If Israel refuses to let us return to the Golan, will it agree to let us go to Jericho? Suppose it does agree, who will be the commander of our forces? According to the agreement, 'Arafat is banned from forming an army.

[Sa'dah] I mean security and the police, Mr. President. They have said they might seek Egypt or Jordan's help in this. Could they seek Syria's help, too?

[Al-Asad] They have not said Syria. But even if they asked and we were in the position to help, we would certainly not go, because Israel controls the outer border. How could we enter then? Whoever controls the border is bound to control those inside the border. There is no room for this assumption, because Israel cannot accept it, and 'Arafat cannot impose his control and decision on Israel.

[Sa'dah] Some people, particularly in the French quarters, say Syria really wants peace, but is asking for a high price, which Israel cannot afford to pay. What could persuade Israel to withdraw from the Golan without something in return?

[Al-Asad] What they would get in return is peace. The talks revolve around the UN resolutions, which stipulate Israel's withdrawal from the territories it occupied; the U.S. initiative says so, too. We entered the peace process on this basis, so did Israel, because none of the parties had its own basis. The basis of the process was clear to everybody. If Israel thought it would gain nothing in return, it would not have entered the peace process. It makes no sense that in exchange for peace, those who are entitled to a right should give up part of their territory or national soil. It is unacceptable under the charters or norms to which people are accustomed for a people to give up part or all of their territory to make peace with another party; such a thing is only permissible in war, for example, when countries surrender and the occupier imposes its will on them. This is different. We are discussing peace, not surrender. Israel will get something in return. Opening up deals with the Arab countries is a very big reward and has been an Israeli dream. But as long as Israel finds something potentially useful in conditions in the Arab world, it will attempt to get a higher price or more in terms of expanding its dreams, because it has both the desire and the greed.

[Sa'dah] What does President al-Asad think of Christopher's declaration that his country is prepared to place U.S. troops in the Golan, as it did in Sinai, to encourage Israel to withdraw from it?

[Al-Asad] Nobody discussed this with me, and no agreement on it was reached with anybody. We hear such talk in statements. And perhaps it was raised during talks, but this issue was not discussed. Perhaps, as I said, it was proposed in preliminary talks, but we agreed on no point in that respect. Of course, we discussed equitable and equal security arrangements on both sides, which is probably one of the items agreed upon in Washington as part of the Syrian paper. We said we accept the presence of international troops on the border, but we did not discuss the nationality of these troops. We discussed principles. In general, we discuss everything eventually. Naturally, when we reach this point, each party will insist on forces that give it a guarantee; one party may not accept the troops chosen by the other party. In that case, we would look for solutions acceptable to both sides.

[Sa'dah] How do you explain the Palestinian dissent over the recent agreement? I am not referring to the factions known for their differences with the PLO, but to some PLO leaders, such as Faruq Qaddumi and others, who suddenly stood up against the agreement and against 'Arafat himself? Could Qaddumi, for instance, one of the most prominent PLO leaders, have been in the dark about eight months of secret events in Norway?

[Al-Asad] They say they didn't know. They say the contacts were known to a few and, as such, only these few knew of the information. Even among themselves they are sly.

[Sa'dah] My information shows that Yasir 'Arafat asserted that not one Arab country should know about the secret talks and that Israel insisted on briefing Egypt on the talks, but without giving details.

[Al-Asad] This was said. But 'Arafat gave the impression in the Arab arena that Egypt knew of the talks. I heard 'Arafat say something like this during a news conference in Cairo. He stressed that Egypt's fingerprints are evident on the agreement.

[Sa'dah] We noticed that in his speech, President Clinton failed to mention Egypt's role, while he highlighted Norway's role. Likewise, 'Arafat's speech at the White House ceremony failed to mention his remarks during his news conference. Interviewed on Egyptian television, 'Arafat said: Egypt is our partner, and we thank it for this role.

[Al-Asad] It is premature to rely on what one person or another says.

[Sa'dah] 'Arafat affirmed that the difference in opinion among the Palestinian leaders is healthy, part of democracy. He also said he can reunite the Palestinian rank. What is your comment?

[Al-Asad] Is it democratic to hide information from those who are supposed to be 'Arafat's partners in decisionmaking? We know what democracy means in some parts of the Arab homeland. 'Arafat says he could become like President Yeltsin, that he coexisted with the Jews during his childhood and youth, and that he has become a close friend of Israel's leaders. Why didn't he reveal all these things before? Why did he hide them from his closest assistants?

[Sa'dah] We heard Palestinian organizations and groups calling for 'Arafat's assassination on charges of treason. Note that these organizations reside in Damascus. Also, Syria neither objected to nor approved the agreement. How can this be explained, Mr. President?

[Al-Asad] This is also democracy. We know that when differences erupt among some of our Palestinian brothers, they try to blame this or that side for such differences and make statements that don't express their convictions. Some say one thing in front of me and another behind my back. Some of the Palestinian brothers sometimes accuse us of trying to patronize them and, at other times, they praise our pan-Arab commitment toward the Palestinian issue. They did not improve their relations with many Arabs when they should have endeavored to gain Arab support. Some Palestinians interfered in some Arab countries' domestic affairs, causing a setback. Naturally, they cannot interfere like this in Syria, because our pan-Arab positions are impeccable.

Perhaps 'Arafat can't deny that Syria has repeatedly intervened to protect him against those followers who are intent on assassinating him. We intervened three times to save 'Arafat from murder. We saved him from his closest followers and from the coup the Palestine Liberation Army [PLA] was preparing against him. The basic elements of the PLA are present in Syria. Unlike other countries in which the PLA is stationed, we give it weapons similar to those we supply to the Syrian Army. The PLA was only supposed to get light weapons, according to a decision when it was established.

The Palestinian majority opposes attempts to harm Syria, because it knows the extent of our sacrifices for the Palestinian cause. This is our role and responsibility. Perhaps you know that the procession from the al-Yarmuk camp in Damascus to reject the 'Arafat agreement was peaceful. None of the things happened that happen in similar processions in other Arab countries. Had we gone along with the elements who oppose 'Arafat's policy, he would have been harmed long ago. Syria does not want and is not ready to get involved in any action that does not concern it.

[Sa'dah] Rabin has criticized Syria because it is engaged in the peace negotiations, while at the same it allows Palestinian extremists to make threats and express their opposition to the Gaza-Jericho agreement from Damascus.

[Al-Asad] First, when these people Rabin calls Palestinian extremists opposed us, we did not stop them. How can we stop them if they oppose Israel's policy on something that relates to the core of their issue? Second, Rabin could not stop the Likud opposing the Gaza-Jericho plan. So, how can he ask us—and, of course, we will not agree to his request—to silence the Palestinians who oppose the agreement? We believe the case of these Palestinians is the same as the Likud case in Rabin's eyes.

Don't forget that the Palestinians in Syria have had the same rights as the Syrians since 1948. The Arab League later adopted a resolution that the PLA should be independent. By the way, 'Arafat pays the PLA soldiers' salaries in some Arab countries and does not pay them in Syria. He does not supply them with weapons, although the PLA's general command has historically been in Syria. Compulsory military service in the Syrian Army was applied to the Palestinians before they had their own independent army. Palestinians served as ministers, university presidents, and in all professions. The Arab decision was that these people should not acquire citizenship in the countries they live in, so as to retain their Palestinian identity.

Second Part of al-Asad Interview

JN2209192393 Cairo AL-AKHBAR in Arabic 21 Sep 93 pp 4, 5

[Second part of a two-part interview with President Hafiz al-Asad in Damascus by Ibrahim Sa'dah, chairman of the board of AL-AKHBAR; date not given]

[Text] I told President al-Asad: At this stage in Arab history, Arab solidarity is an imperative necessity. What do you think of the Arab League's initiative to restore Arab solidarity? How do we go about mapping out an Arab strategy to cope with new realities?

Al-Asad said: I agree with your assessment, especially under the kind of circumstances and challenges we are facing.

I have said over and over that the gravest threat to our Arab entity lies in the disarray of our ranks. If we are responsible people, we must achieve Arab solidarity. Arab solidarity is a top priority for President Mubarak and myself, since ours is a common destiny. Since we are talking about solidarity, I would like to make it clear that the energetic Egyptian-Syrian moves on the peacemaking front are a way of telling other Arabs that we must close ranks if we are after real and just peace based on UN Security Council resolutions. A less-than-just peace adds up to potential flashpoints, instability, and embittered parties—a fertile ground for all all kinds of danger feared by the international community.

After a short pause, the president went on: The time is now right for Arab reconciliation, the one option left. We only need goodwill on all sides. We have one language in common. We share the same historical background and geographical area and one destiny, and yet we seem unable to agree among ourselves. In contrast, others who lack such bonds agree among themselves, because they are aware of the importance of pooling their resources in a world where small geographical entities stand no chance. In any case, we in Syria, Egypt, Algeria, and Libya and the Gulf states are not plagued by differences or divisions.

Syria and Egypt can lay out strategies and plans to cope with the threats hanging over the present pan-Arab national security and lay the groundwork for solidarity. Egypt and Syria will have to do all they can to rally the Arabs around the goal of Arab solidarity. I personally think that eventually Arab solidarity will come.

Incidentally, I have known President Husni Mubarak from as far back as the days of unity between Egypt and Syria. Our relationship has grown tighter over the years. We have shared memories and our friendship grew stronger in the runup to the 1973 October war when he was vice president. President Mubarak is a friendly, kindly, and reassuring man who is characteristically clear and straightforward. He

does not beat about the bush and is at once wise and courageous. President Mubarak also does all he can to advance Arab interests.

I told al-Asad: We know that Egypt and its people figure high on the list of your interests, and that the October war was a product of Egyptian-Syrian cooperation and that coordination between President Mubarak and yourself led the Arab drive that made the liberation of Kuwait possible.

Al-Asad replied:

Exactly; we hope there will be even greater coordination and cooperation in the bilateral and broader Arab interest. Syrian- Egyptian coordination has always been a source of strength for the Arab world. Incidentally, my visits to Egypt and Mubarak's to Syria are not constrained by any formalities or protocol, because they are a move from one part of the homeland to the other. We condemn all acts of terror Egypt has been experiencing. We follow all such acts with pain. Every Arab understands that to undermine Egypt has always been a colonial objective and that a strong Egypt means a strong Arab world.

Mr. President: May I ask you why you refused to take part in the peace process which led to the Camp David agreement between Egypt and Israel, while you agreed to negotiate with the Israelis now?

President al-Asad said: This is a long, long story. Let me first speak about the nature of Egyptian-Syrian relations. Understanding the nature of these relations will certainly lead to a deeper understanding of this relationship and its requirements. Afterward, you will receive the answer to your question. You know, brother Ibrahim, that we established unity in 1958. For us, unity was a dream which we entertained since we were children. The sense of belonging to the state which was called the United Arab Republic created an unparalleled sense of pride and vigor in our souls. We had a firm conviction that pan-Arab security would not be complete without Egypt and Syria, and that Egypt and Syria are the two wings lifting the Arab nation. Our faith in Syrian-Egyptian relations emanates from a profound understanding of history and geography. History tells us that Egypt and Syria have been one homeland throughout history, and that as soon as Syria gets away from Egypt, or Egypt gets away from Syria, Arabs suffer disasters. In the same vein, each time Syria and Egypt converged as one homeland, Arabs prevailed and expelled all powers that came to colonize or control their land. In sum, the unity between Egypt and Syria is based on a long militant past and a joint history. This history may differ in some of its details, but it its main events and landmarks are shared.

President al-Asad added: As you know, we established unity. However, there were plots and some tried to destroy it. Of course, many people are to blame. Although the Syrian people used to criticize President 'Abd-al-Nasir during unity because of some shortcomings, when the secession took place, the Syrian people's sentiments were completely reversed, and they supported 'Abd-al-Nasir as enthusiastically as they did at the beginning. However, several negative developments took place. In my opinion, these negative developments had nothing to do with 'Abd-al-Nasir. However, the general rule is that when something occurs in a certain country, people view the head of state as responsible for what has happened. For example, if an incident takes place in, say, Dayr al-Zawr in Syria, people may praise me or blame me. This is because people suppose that the head of state should be aware of all that takes place in his country. They consider him responsible, whether negatively or positively, since he is at the head of authority. I say again that during unity, some people were angry with 'Abd-al-Nasir and blamed him. However, this anger and blame did not justify the secession or cause the union to break. Responsibility is shared by a number of officials in Egypt and Syria because they focused their attention on personal matters and let their imaginations move away from reality. Even those who undertook the secession later regretted it. The masses are still angry with them. At any rate, they could not stay in power. Had you come to Damascus at that time and sat at one of its cafes, you would have seen daily and even hourly pictures of struggle between the Army and the workers, between the police and students, struggle in streets and alleys. At the Havana cafe—which is an old, traditional cafe—I used to see nothing but tears. Hundreds of citizens were under constant chase. However, the people could not be muted. For its part, the Army was overwhelmingly indignant about the secession. Therefore, as I said, the secession leaders could not stay for long. They started to look for the people who worked against them with real panic. A year later, the first movement took place. It was called the Aleppo movement. In fact, it was not an Aleppo movement, but the movement of entire Syria. There were some mistakes in it, but those who went to jail for defending the unity were many, including myself. Some people were jailed without a trial. Others remained in prison after trials.

I told President al-Asad: Mr. President, I remember meeting the al-Nahlawi group in Switzerland after they had been exiled. They were expelled from Syria and had taken up residence in Lausanne. They sent a letter to Jamal 'Abd-al-Nasir apologizing for what they done. AKHBAR AL-YAWM published an interview with them. Following this interview, they were expelled from Switzerland and went to Germany?

President al-Asad said: We were in Egypt at the time. Of course, there is a story behind our presence in Cairo. When we came here to Damascus, we were given forced leave. Those coming from Cairo wanted to be reassured about their families. After I returned from a six-day leave, I found a decree waiting for me, discharging me and several other army officers.

President al-Asad smiled and continued: The funny thing is that I came from a Cairo prison to a Damascus prison. Yes, I was imprisoned in Cairo for dealing with politics. My imprisonment was caused by the subversive policy of some agencies which wanted to cover up for their failure. You ask me how? I say: The day the secession took place, I was in Inshas in a nighttime flight squadron. Before the

unity, we went to Russia for courses. After the unity, I returned directly as part of a big squadron to the United Arab Republic. I came to Cairo because it had been decided to divide the squadron in two, one that would leave for the north and another for the south. The unity was terminated and the sqaudron was not divided. I and two others from the squadron were transferred to al-'Arish. My transfer was a proof that the agencies had committed mistakes because my field of specialization was not in al-'Arish. I am a nighttime pilot. A colleague of mine was transferred to a judicial post in the operations headquarters. I remember that I became angry at the time, and I even violated military propriety. I became angry because my presence in al-'Arish had nothing to with my field of specialization. But when the agencies want to take vengeance on someone, they do anything. As I said, the accusation against me was that I had dealt with politics. This accusation came as a surprise. I was a member of the Ba'th party, and I came here in that capacity. Earlier, I had told them that I was a Ba'th party member. This was no secret. Another thing, which everyone knows, is that the Ba'th party is the party which realized unity because it was the only organized force in Syria and was in control of the Syrian street. 'Abd-al-Nasir was aware of this reality. The actual control in Syria was in the hands of the Ba'th party, and it was the force that controlled the people and the Army because it was the only organized force.

President al-Asad smiled while remembering his imprisonment in Cairo. He said: I was in Ismailia when the secession took place. I was in one of the operations rooms as I was the officer in charge on duty. Several officers were with me. I had no other alternative but to follow the developments from Cairo. During that time, I took swimming lessons. I am from Latakia, and like Alexandria, people there are supposed to know how to swim. However, customs did not encourage the exercise of this sport. In Ismailia, we sat on the shore and started to learn to swim. Being physically fit helped me. I repeat: The day the secession took place, I was a captain in the military police. The commander of that area suddenly summoned me. The funny thing is that discipline was further enhanced. Following the secession, they took us to the Air force's headquarters. After a while, a car came and we rode in it. They told us: We are going to the mess. I said: This is not the Air force's headquarters. I know the Air Force's headquarters, and this is not it. They said again: We will go the mess. A few moments later, we found ourselves in front of a big iron gate over which was written: Prison polishes, disciplines, and reforms.

I asked the officer: Is this the mess hall?

Mockingly, he answered: Yes.

I asked him: Can we find cigarettes at the mess hall?

He answered: Yes.

I asked him: Is there water?

He answered me angrily: Yes.

I then responded, saying: Open the door quickly.

We then found ourselves in prison. In prison, I found Ba'thist officers. I later learned that we were imprisoned because we had spoken on political issues. In prison, we followed the news of the secession. As a matter of fact, this charge was dumbfounding to me. For, the leaders are supposed to be aware of our identities. What was immensely saddening to us was that we found in prison opponents as well as proponents of the union. Then, we began to speak about 'Abd-al-Nasir. I expressed our anger with 'Abd-al-Nasir frankly, because he failed to act to reinstate the union. Afterward, we were freed, and we returned to Syria.

Al-Asad continued: Brother Ibrahim, you are asking about the story of my dispute with al-Sadat. I would like to say it honestly that I was among those who were most pained because al-Sadat died as he did. For we planned together for the October war. I wished he was still alive so I could discuss with him some of the mistakes made during the October war. I do not want to dwell on lengthy details right now. Who knows? They may be documented someday. The dispute with al-Sadat surfaced because he departed from the plan we drew up together for the war, and also because he unilaterally made decisions which were extremely and gravely harmful. For instance, al-Sadat decided to wage the war even though some of its requirements in terms of weapons and otherwise were not available to him.

Al-Sadat did not give his aides the freedom to express their own views, especially on technical issues. I recall having asked Field Marshall Ahmad Isma'il [former Egyptian defense official] whether he had enough ammunition. His answer was in the affirmative. But when I repeated the same question in the presence of al-Sadat, Isma'il said that the ammunition was inadequate. I then asked them: How then will you engage in fighting once again? This would be a big risk. I added: Sufficient ammunitions must be secured immediately. Al-Sadat said: I wrote to the Russians about this. But, they have not replied to my request yet. I found this reply strange, and asked him: If they fail to respond, should we then commit suicide? Suicide in such a case would not be individual. It would be the suicide of a people. If you fail, this would be your last battle. He then asked me: What should we do then? I answered him, saying: The only choice we have is to convince the Russians. He retorted, saying: For one whole year, they have not sent a response. I told him: Leave the issue to me. I will explore ways that will spare us the risks of adventures. I added: It is true, brother Anwar, that we are coming under domestic pressure, but we have to shoulder the responsibility. He said: I will leave the matter to you. This took place in April. I immediately summoned the Soviet ambassador and asked him for an urgent meeting with Soviet leaders. The ambassador attempted to postpone the meeting, contending that the Soviet Union is a superpower, and that visits to the Soviet Union are not arranged on such short notice. He added that visits are sometimes arranged one year before they take place. I answered the ambassador, who was trusted by his leaders and us alike, saying: If no date for my visit is set before the end of the

month, I will never go to the Soviet Union. The ambassador was disturbed by this, but he explained the situation to his leaders.

On the following day he said: The visit of a head of state has been put off so you may go to Geneva to see Brezhnev. Brezhnev had an alert mind and sound logic, plus a ready wit. Without leading up to my point, I said to him: Egypt and Syria have decided to go to war and we would like your support, and we are disadvantaged by a severe shortage in ammunition. Naturally, he asked that we wait and the conversation dragged on. He then asked: How do you propose to go to war in five days when you haven't got the ammunition? To which I said: Make a decision to supply us with it, and we may put off the war for a month or two. His response was: So be it. Al-Sadat was naturally apprehensive of the commencement of university classes in October. I returned from the USSR to Egypt and communicated to al-Sadat the details, and within days vessels began to arrive. In certain respects, al-Sadat took an anti-Soviet line. For my part, I tried to convince him that the USSR was a friend of the Arabs. Al-Sadat, accompanied by Ashraf Marwan, and myself, later had talks in Syria during a one-day visit here. I forgot to say that if it were not for the tete-a-tete between Ahmad Islam'il and myself, I would not have known about the ammunition scarcity. Syria at the time had no shortage of ammunition. Of course, a country about to go to war always needs ammunition, but Egypt was in greater need for it. At al-Sadat's meeting with me in Syria, we discussed dates. He said: I want to go to war before university classes commence to avoid problems. Of course, war has its own accurate calculations, especially if the outcome is doubtful. I recall that at the last visit to my office, Ahmad Isma'il and Egyptian and Syrian military officers huddled together to debate the most appropriate date for starting war. The Egyptians argued that the ideal moment for starting the hostilities was nighttime, to help them in the crossing. For the Syrian front, the ideal time would be dawn. Each side had a good case. Ahmad Isma'il said: Let's coordinate and move simultaneously. The zero hour was set for 1400—a compromise whereby the Syrian side obtained part of what it sought and the Egyptian side 90 percent. Of course, the time was set after checking with academics who had made a thorough study of maps and then left the decision to the political echelons. It was decided that the Egyptian Army would move from a point 250 km from the border and the Syrian Army from a point 20-30 km from the border. The Syrian Army was supposed to complete its mission in 48 hours, but the Egyptian Army would require a longer period. I estimated that if the Syrian Army moved simultaneously with the Egyptian Army, the Israeli Army would be all deployed on the Syrian front, and would later make for the Egyptian front. In such a scenario, the Israeli Army would have the advantage. We, therefore, thought that the Egyptian Army should at least advance to the straits, and when it got there the two armies would move at the same time. This is because under such a plan, the Israeli Army would not be in a position to take on each front separately.

President al-Asad said: Of course, this logic proved unacceptable to the Egyptian side, which was one of the salient liabilities of the situation. I knew as I was speaking that the adoption of my proposal would cost us much. To begin with, if the Egyptian Army moved on its own, its morale would not be high. Likewise, when the Syrian Army would learn that the Egyptian Army had moved unilaterally, while Syria remained on the sideline, it would become resentful, and an hour in this situation would cost us dearly. As a leadership, we could not wait, even assuming that a leader should be swayed by his mind. So it was decided that we would move at 1400 and so we did.

After a short pause, President al-Asad said: I wished that President al-Sadat had lived longer so that I could discuss his decisions with him. We are not angels. We are only human and sometimes make mistakes. One must learn from his mistakes. The plan was a joint one, but we suffered from the individualistic decision. We could have achieved much more if we had had coordination. Half of the Golan Heights would have been in our hands because our losses would have been small and the enemy would not have been able to push us back. When I met al-Sadat after the war, I confronted him with the various aspects of negligence. I told him: You wasted our chance to liberate the land without any trouble. The Egyptian Army showed good competence and it could have continued. He said: There was no air cover to enable the Egyptian Army to cross the Suez Canal. The Israeli air forces is powerful and the United States has sent in aircraft. I said: We have studied all these matters and set our joint plan accordingly. It is useless to discuss things in such a way after the war.

At any rate, I was pleased when the Egyptian military confirmed the soundness of our view. In his first speech to the parliament after the cease-fire, al-Sadat praised Syria and when I met him, he said: I know what happened in Syria. I know about the civilian and military targets they hit.

In fact, we have not seen such a bombardment of civilian targets in terms of intensity and quality throughout all battles of war. There was an average of 1,000 air sorties against Syria every day, and I expected that. As resistance grew further, they became more brutal and called in the reserves to settle matters quickly.

As you remember, al-Sadat sent me an Egyptian official to tell me that the Soviet ambassador in Egypt had informed him that the Yugoslavs had proposed a plan for a cease-fire and an immediate Israeli withdrawal. The Egyptian official said the United States wanted negotiations, and within six months the problem would be over. He said the guarantee we had was the fact that our troops were still there and we could return to war.

Of course, this outcome was not satisfactory as far as we were concerned. There was a great public mood supporting fighting. Despite the fact that electricity networks in Syria were sabotaged, the Interior Ministry did not record a single crime in Syria during that period. Of course, I gathered all brothers in the National Progressive Front and contacted the Arab brothers, and wrote to the United

Nations that we agree to the cease-fire decision in return for a complete withdrawal and guaranteeing the Palestinian people's rights.

The Syrian president remained silent for a while, then said: It seems that I spoke at length about the subject, however, I will speak briefly about the causes of my differences with al-Sadat. The end of the battles was not in harmony, in my opinion, with the beginning or with the road we had walked on. In my opinion, the objective is not separated from the road. In other words, not any means suits any objective. The road on which al-Sadat walked did not suit the pride of the October war, and therefore, we differed. I imagined that his address at the People's Assembly on his decision to go to Israel was a maneuver. The other thing is that the story which al-Sadat told me, in my capacity as his partner in the war, was unbelievable. Speaking about what took place in Romania with Ceausescu, al-Sadat said: With regard to the Golan, there is no difficulty, but there are difficulties with regard to Egypt and Palestine. He also said that among the options which were presented was to exchange land for other land in Lebanon. Al-Sadat added: On my way from Romania to Iran, I thought of calling on the five major powers to hold a preparatory meeting for a peace conference. How can five countries prepare for a peace conference? For whom would they prepare such a conference? Al-Sadat added: When I landed in Tehran, I thought: Why should we make the journey longer? I thought of seeing the Jews. When I arrived in Saudi Arabia the idea became ripe in my head.

I asked him: Did Saudi Arabia agree with you on this? He said: Of course, not. This immediate response was the only expected answer to my question. However, he wanted to imply that Saudi Arabia was in agreement. When I asked the brothers in Saudi Arabia they denied that he presented the subject to them. Al-Sadat continued: God willing, I will go to Jerusalem and pray in al-Aqsa Mosque, and I will also stop at the Knesset. I tried to convince him to change his mind, but he refused and went on with his plan. I even told him that this issue cannot be accepted in Syria. And I believe that it is not even accepted in Egypt now.

What al-Sadat did further divided the Arabs and sparked the wars in Lebanon. Nothing changed until President Mubarak assumed power; and Mubarak is not responsible for what took place at that time.

President al-Asad said: There is no question about the peace process but about the method.

You asked me about my feeling when I saw 'Arafat signing the agreement with Rabin at the White House [as published] and my feeling when I saw al-Sadat in Israel. I say that the feeling is different, because Syria and Egypt, the real influential states in the Arab nation, have just ended a war that restored Arab dignity and produced splendid political, military, and economic results. I remember that one of the Arab rulers had told me before the October war that companies would not allow us to raise the prices [of oil], but after the war we raised the prices as we wanted. I told him that everybody benefited from the war except those who waged it and who were behind raising the price of oil from $3 per barrel to $30 per barrel. In fact, the rise in the prices of oil harmed us since the prices of oil and commodities became high in our country.

In brief, al-Sadat did not ask about the alternative. He said: If I succeed that will be fine, and if I do not succeed I will bear the responsibility. I told him: Wait, the whole world seeks peace and there is a proposal to resume the Geneva conference which convened in 1967.

You asked me about our excuses for accepting the endeavor to achieve peace now. I want to tell you that we are among the countries which embrace a humanitarian message for the whole world, a message of love, peace, and cooperation which rejects destruction and occupation of others' land. The prophets, as you know, lived in our countries. Christ, peace be upon him, lived in our countries; Prophet Muhammad, God's prayers and peace be upon him, was the agent of Khadijah [the prophet's wife] and met the monk Buhayrah. And Salah-al-Din proceeded from Damascus to put an end to the Crusader campaign. We want the land to be a land of peace, friendship—no aggression or occupation. We always call for peace based on justice; we call for a comprehensive and lasting peace. We seek a peace which is based on justice, which achieves complete withdrawal from the occupied Arab territory, and which gives the Palestinian people their rights. There is no doubt that Syria inaugurated the road of peace when it agreed on the U.S. initiative based on the implementation of Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 and on exchanging land for peace. And this is what is meant by the two resolutions. Our conditions and demands are the same; they have not changed and will never change today or tomorrow. The whole world has become aware of our view of peace. Peace is not something you can buy or sell; it will never be at the expense of the land. Anything less than this will be capitulation and no force on earth can impose capitulation on us. Syria will not relinquish an inch of the Golan. We have always said that Syria will never relinquish an inch of the Golan and that there will be no compromise on the issue of land. Israel is aware that geography does not achieve security and that separate deals do not achieve peace.

We have accepted the peace initiative and endeavor now because we believe that the chances for peace now are better than they were several years ago. The chances for peace are better now because of the international climate and the increasing number of people who want peace inside Israel. We should not forget that exhaustive efforts were made prior to the peace process. The U.S. Administration and Israel know that there is no possibility of a compromise on the issue of land, and in Syria nobody can relinquish one inch of land because he will be considered a traitor.

President Clinton affirmed to me, during his telephone conversation, U.S. commitment to work to achieve progress on all tracks. Everybody knows that the Government of Israel is the one that sticks to maneuvering and deception. It is also known that Syria has fully and

honestly responded to peace requirements, proved its political credibility, and done its utmost to help achieve peace.

Al-Asad, Delegation Return to Damascus 22 Sep

JN2209191393 Damascus Syrian Arab Republic Radio Network in Arabic 1815 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] President Hafiz al-Asad returned to Damascus this evening after a visit to the Arab Republic of Egypt. During the visit, al-Asad held talks with Egyptian President Muhammad Husni Mubarak at Ra's al-Tin Palace in Alexandria. The accompanying delegation returned with the president.

President Muhammad Husni Mubarak led those who bade farewell to the president at Alexandria's airport. Egyptian Prime Minister Dr. 'Atif Sidqi, several ministers, the Alexandria governor, senior Army officers, and Syria's ambassador to Egypt also bade farewell to the president.

Al-Asad's Egypt Visit, AL-AKHBAR Interview Noted

JN2309095193 Damascus Syrian Arab Republic Radio Network in Arabic 0455 GMT 23 Sep 93

[From the press review]

[Text] The newspaper TISHRIN writes on President Hafiz al-Asad's visit to Egypt and his talks with President Husni Mubarak in Alexandria. It stresses that this visit will have an important effect on the overall situation in the region, particularly the peace process, in addition to the firm and strong relations between the two fraternal countries.

TISHRIN says: The firm and strong relations between Syria and Egypt constitute a real guarantee for the Arabs and a solid ground for supporting our just cause. Based on this, consultations, coordination, and cooperation between the two countries, particularly at the top level between Presidents al-Asad and Mubarak, constitute an important and basic element to safeguard the constants of the pan-Arab stand and to adhere to the pillars of a just and comprehensive peace which will put an end to the Israeli occupation, and guarantee the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

TISHRIN notes that in this regard, President Hafiz al-Asad stressed that we want peace which is based on justice and full withdrawal, and which gives the Palestinian people their full rights. There is no force on earth that can impose capitulation on us. We will not relinquish a single inch of the Golan.

The paper says: While reiterating its persistent efforts and great concern for achieving a just and comprehensive peace, Syria sincerely seeks to achieve stability in the region and security and tranquility in the Middle East. Only a just and comprehensive peace can bring this.

TISHRIN stresses that peace and occupation cannot go together, and that peace cannot be achieved in installments, and it cannot be be divided. It adds: Through a panoramic pan-Arab view, President Hafiz al-Asad has made it clear that geography cannot achieve security, and that separate deals cannot achieve peace. Israel knows this. Therefore, its insistence on partial solutions and separate deals proves that it does not want a just and comprehensive peace. Neither does it want to respond to the pillars of this peace. It does not want to see the region enjoying stability and security. In fact, it wants to complicate the situation and to maintain its occupation of Arab territories.

Under the headline "Syria, the Firm Principle," the newspaper AL-THAWRAH highlights President Hafiz al-Asad's important and comprehensive interview with Cairo AL-AKHBAR. AL-THAWRAH says: President al-Asad has reiterated the constants of the Syrian stand toward the peace process, Syria's concern about the continuation of this process, and its commitment to a just and comprehensive peace which is based on the implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations and the Security Council, and which is also based on the spirit of the Madrid conference and the essence of the land for peace formula.

AL-THAWRAH adds: With extreme frankness, clarity, and determination to tell the truth, leader al-Asad answered questions that are of concern to the world and to the masses from the Gulf to the Ocean in light of the accelerated developments in the Arab, regional, and international arenas as a result of the signing of the Gaza-Jericho agreement and its repercussions on the region and the future of Arab situation.

AL-THAWRAH stresses that these masses found no supporter against calamities other than Syria and leader al-Asad to assume pan-Arab responsibilities.

It says: As the nation and the Arab masses have always expected, Syria has been and is still the focus of the nation's hopes at times of crises and tragedies.

Concluding, AL-THAWRAH says: When leader al-Asad stresses that Syria will not relinquish its national soil, that a compromise solution concerning the issue of land is inapplicable, and that there is no force on earth which can impose capitulation on us, he reassures the Arab citizen that the pan-Arab arena and the nation's fateful issues have continued to be, regardless of all that has happened, in honest hands that will never relinquish one iota of land or rights.

India

Rao Views Visit to Iran, Pakistan Ties

BK2309033693 Delhi All India Radio Network in English 0245 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Text] The prime minister says India and Pakistan can solve their problems without mediation, if Islamabad is willing and sincere. Talking to newsmen on board the aircraft while returning from Tehran last night, Mr. P.V. Narasimha Rao said he has not made any fresh proposal for the settlement of the Kashmir problem during his discussions with the Iranian president, Mr. Hashemi-Rafsanjani. Mr. Rao said the main hurdle in relations with Pakistan is the aiding and abetting of terrorists by that country to create problems in Kashmir valley.

Giving a resume of his visit, the prime minister said he had wide-ranging discussions with the Iranian leaders, particularly in the field of exchange of expertise and experience in science and technology. Mr. Rao said he had no specific discussion on any particular subject, but, some important joint ventures did come up. Mr. Rao said one of these was a laying of a pipeline for the supply of natural gas from Iran to India. He said the question is whether it will be through the land route or through the sea. Mr. Rao said a project study for the work is likely to be completed in about a year. Iran is also interested in Indian help for the development of railway in that country. Other subjects like customs, roads, and port facilities also came up for discussion and two memoranda of understanding were signed on science and technology, and surface transport and transit facilities.

About his talks with businessmen and intellectuals, he said many of them are interested in setting up ventures in India. Mr. Rao said on the whole, the visit was a renewal of the existing cordial bilateral relations and hoped it will help in expanding them further.

Later, on his arrival in New Delhi last night, the prime minister expressed satisfaction over the visit. Talking to newsmen, Mr. Narasimha Rao said his visit will speed up the process of bilateral cooperation. He said the Iranian president, Mr. Rafsanjani described the visit as a turning point in Indo-Iranian relations. The Iranian leaders have promised to consider India's proposal for transit facilities for India's goods to the landlocked Central Asian countries. About his meeting with the Iranian spiritual leader, Mr. Rao said Mr. Khamene'i gave full endorsement to closer relations between the two countries. Mr. Rao termed his address to the Iranian parliament, the Majles, as a special gesture by Iranian leaders. The prime minister said during the address, he explained India's secular system. When asked to comment on developments in Russia, Mr. Rao said the whole picture is not yet clear. However, he said, it is Russia's internal matter.

Officials Discuss Implementation of Accord With PRC

BK2209120993 Delhi INDIAN EXPRESS in English 14 Sep 93 p 11

[Text] New Delhi—Senior government officials admitted on Monday that the implementation of the recently signed Sino-Indo agreement on the Line of Actual Control [LAC] would be a "slow process".

In an informal chat with newspersons, the officials pointed out that the expert group which will delineate the LAC will start functioning only at the end of this year or early next year. It will submit its report from time to time to the Joint Working Group dealing with the boundary issue and other aspects of the Sino-Indo relations.

The officials said it was difficult to set a time-frame for the completion of the expert group's task. The redeployment of troops along the LAC could begin only when an agreement is reached on the alignment of the Line.

However, the agreement on the LAC would have a positive impact on Sino-Indo ties, they maintained, as both countries could begin exploring other aspects of co-operation including trade, joint ventures and technical collaborations.

The officials described the agreement as a "watershed" in Sino-Indo ties.

The expert group which is to work on the LAC will consist of officials from the Foreign and Defence Ministries and the Surveyor General's Office.

Explaining the need for the agreement, the officials said that although the border with China has been peaceful after the 1962 war, the recently signed document would translate a nebulous understanding into a formal arrangement, thereby virtually eliminating the chances of another conflict.

They denied that India had conceded anything to the Chinese. On the contrary, The government was trying to come to grips with the situation on the ground and approach the whole issue with common sense. They cautioned against drawing up a balance-sheet of what had been lost and what had been gained as the entire process had yet to begin.

The atmosphere of the talks between Prime Minister Narasimha Rao and his Chinese counterpart, Li Peng, was a vast improvement on the exchanges during the latter's visit to New Delhi in 1991, the officials said. It was exceedingly relaxed and candid.

Editorial Comments on Rao Visit to China

BK2209055393 Calcutta ANANDABAZAR PATRIKA in Bengali 11 Sep 93 p 4

[Editorial: "Positive Step"]

[Text] The prime minister's recent visit to China can be termed successful if the border dispute with that country is resolved. The over enthusiasm which was observed during a similar visit made by Rajiv Gandhi to China in the year 1988 was conspicuously absent this time. The main reason behind this is that Rao did not have to take a lot of trouble to make this trip. The ground work for normalization of ties between the two countries was made by his predecessors. Besides, there were no great expectations regarding his visit. It was more or less known what would be the outcome of his trip. Fortunately, several accords including the one on the settlement of the border dispute have been signed between the two countries. Though a permanent

solution of the border dispute has not yet been made, it is expected that it will be possible in the near future. No one knows when it will be possible as China is not in favor of taking any hurried decisions. It may take one year, one decade, or even a century.

Despite this, Rao's visit can be termed successful as the accord signed between the two countries has provisions for maintaining peace along their borders. Their agreement regarding the reduction of troops deployed along the borders is, no doubt, a positive step. Nine divisions of the army are currently deployed along the border. It would not be difficult to bring down this figure to three or two divisions in stages. Although there is a dispute regarding the demarcation of border, the Line of Actual Control has since long become the border between India and China. There is no doubt that a day will come when this Line of Actual Control will be recognized as the official border between the two countries. But until that time this Line of Control should be kept tension free. There is no doubt that both the countries are in favor of this and, with this end in view, the border accord has been signed.

The other agreements signed between the two countries include the restoration of the old border trade protocol, the establishment of trade centers in Himachal Pradesh and Tibet, the exchange of scientists and technologists, and joint initiatives environmental protection. Those who expected the prime minister's visit to achieve something regarding the issue of Tibet will be frustrated. Everyone understands that under present circumstances, Rao is not in a position to take up the Tibet issue. The prime minister of the Congress party went to China only to get his name written in history and with the hope of boosting the image of his party with a view to win future elections. He wanted to tell the people after returning from China and Korea how the policies of his government are being accepted abroad and how brightly his personal image shines. Rao wants to tell the people that it was he who had taken the initiative to resolve this long-standing border dispute.

It is possible to reduce the political differences between India and China, but is it is difficult to lessen the competition between the two countries to capture international markets. Both India and China are in favor of a free market economy. Beijing is tolerating the bossing of Washington in its own interest. For this reason, it is enjoying the most favored nations treatment granted by the United States. As there is a conflict between the commercial interests of China and India, it will not be easy to reach an understanding between the two on the economic front. Our prime minister was aware of this reality and he has again been reminded of it.

Vice President Leaves for Visit to Vietnam

BK2209052693 Delhi All India Radio Network in English 0435 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] The vice president, Mr. K.R. Narayanan, left New Delhi for Hanoi this morning on a week-long visit to Vietnam. He was seen off at the airport among others by the minister for civil supplies, Mr. A.K. Anthony, and the deputy chairperson of the Rajya Sabha, Mrs. Najma Heptullah. Speaking to newsmen before his departure, the vice president said that it is a visit of goodwill and friendship.

'Better Appreciation' of Kashmir Issue by U.S. Seen

BK1809085993 Delhi INDIAN EXPRESS in English 10 Sep 93 p 8

[Editorial: "View From Capitol Hill"]

[Text] There is now a better appreciation in Washington of the precise nature of the trouble in Kashmir than before. This much is evident from the resolution passed unanimously in the US Senate Foreign Relations Committee deploring the "reign of terror" unleashed in Kashmir by militants and calling upon Pakistan to desist from giving them sanctuary and equipping them with arms. Until recently, many Congressmen had seemed to have readily swallowed Pakistani propaganda about alleged massive violation of human rights in Kashmir by Indian security forces. But sustained Indian efforts to give a true picture of the state of affairs in Kashmir, in particular the central fact of Pakistani-fomented terrorism, have apparently borne fruit. Thus, despite the fact that the House of Representatives had fallen a prey to the design of the pro-Pakistan lobbies on Capitol Hill by censuring India for its human rights record, the Senate panel has refused to be similarly misled and has had no hesitation in condemning Pakistani activities in Kashmir in a forthright manner. Yet, New Delhi cannot afford to be complacent. It is far from certain if the full Senate will endorse the stand taken by its panel.

It is no secret that Islamabad is spending huge amounts to fuel an anti-Indian bias among the American lawmakers. Experience shows that Pakistani agents will not find it too difficult to identify at least a handful of gullible Congressmen who would do their bidding. Besides, it is Senator Jesse Helms who is the leading India-baiter in the US Congress. In the past he has stood steadfastly by dictators in the Third World in the name of combating communism. Even now Helmes is patronising such a worthy as Jonas Savimbi who is sparing no efforts to sabotage every move to restore peace and stability in Angola. It is Helms's bid to have India censured which has just backfired in the Senate committee. Both he and his Pakistani mentors are bound to mount a new propaganda offensive against India by posing as champions of human rights.

The Indian rebuttal of motivated allegations must focus on two points. One is Pakistan's bid to whip up Islamic passions in Kashmir and fuel terrorism there as the core of its expansionist design on the State. The second is the complexity of the problem of preventing human rights violations in an area which is engulfed in a foreign-guided insurgency. There should, of course, be no let-up in New Delhi's efforts to check human rights violations. That India is serious about this seems to have been appreciated. The Senate committee's resolution in question has, for instance, noted the steps already taken to discipline errant men in the security forces. Above all, the significance of the fact that India is a vibrant democracy does not seem to

have been lost on most US Congressmen. Better understanding abroad of what India is up against in Kashmir should help in nailing Pakistani lies.

Militants Seen as Pressuring Media in Kashmir

BK2209100993 Delhi INDIAN EXPRESS in English 17 Sep 93 p 3

[By S.M.A. Kazmi]

[Text] The print media in Kashmi Valley is caught in the crossfire between various militant outfits which for the past three years have been dictating terms to them.

It was tightrope walking for all the newspapers published fron the Valley since the outbreak of Pakistan-sponsored militancy each militant outfit vied with the other to get maximum coverage. The initial euphoria of eulogising militancy in the newspapers has now created a no-win situation for the print media.

Suspension of publication of AFTAB, Kashmir's premier Urdu daily for 37 years, on September 10 points towards the grim scenario and the helplessness in the wake of threats, intimidation and violence by militants.

The AFTAB's suspension was forced by pro-Pakistan outfit Jamait- ul-Mujahideen. The ban on AFTAB followed an earlier ban on another leading Urdu daily SRINAGAR TIMES by Jammu Kashmir Liberation Front [JKLF] because it had published a statement criticising the outfit.

Two newspapers, AFTAB and ALSAFA refused to publish the rejoinder of JKLF, which was sent with a threat of ban if not carried. It has become a situation like devil on one side and deep sea on the other for the print media as carrying statement of one outfit invites wrath from the other. There are over hundred militant outfits said to be operating in Kashmir.

The "demand" for front page treatment to statements and claims of various outfits has been so heavy that once SRINAGAR TIMES carried an item asking the militant groups to send their statements in brief to be adjusted on front page as more than three dozen statements are received daily—all demanding page one coverage.

In the last four years, newspapers have been throttled at gun point—mediamen killed, their offices burnt, staff kidnapped and ban slapped on publications. Four mediapersons have been killed by militants since 1990. Three of them were from official media while Shaban Vakil was the editor of Urdu daily AL-SAFA.

Lassa Kaul, Director, Doordarshan [DD], was the first to be shot dead in February 1990 followed by the killing of P.N. Handoo, an assistant director in the State Information Department. Syed Ghulam Nabi, joint director of Information Department was kidnapped and later killed by Jamait-ul-Mujahideen .

Almost all the newspapers of the State have been banned at one time or the other, by different militant groups. The offices and houses of the editors and journalists were attacked with bombs, burnt or ransacked.

Militants, besides imposing a code of conduct for what to carry, have also been imposing fines on newspapers for defying their instructlons.

Restrictions were imposed on Delhi newspapers also. The correspondent of INDIAN EXPRESS was asked to leave the Valley in April 1992 for his alleged "anti-movement" reports.

Recently, two officials of the news section of the AIR were kldnapped and let off after beating with warning against working for electronic media.

After resumption of news sections of AIR and DD from Srinagar, all the news officials had received threatening letters to go back and a woman TV artist was shot dead.

Czech Consortium To Execute Oil Pipeline Project

BK2309004893 Delhi All India Radio Network in English 1530 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] The Kangla-Bhatinda oil pipeline is to be executed by a Czech consortium. An agreement for the 1,200 crore-rupee project was signed in New Delhi today. To be completed in 18 months, the pipeline will help meet the increasing demand of petroleum products in the northwest region and the Kangla (Koilyoka) region. The pipeline will have an initial capacity of 6 million tons per year.

Paper Claims Economic Reform 'Gone Awry'

BK2209115793 Delhi INDIAN EXPRESS in English 16 Sep 93 p 8

[Editorial: "Reform Going Awry"]

[Text] Since India's economic reform programme is all about raising the growth rate of the economy, the question needs to be asked if any headway is being made in this regard. The answer, as of now, is a clear no; indeed, going by Reserve Bank data, the economy has entered a phase where it needs far more investment than in the past to get a given unit of output. In the eighties, Rs.360 crore of new investment gave an additional output of Rs.100 crore. This relationship is expressed in an incremental capital-output ratio (ICOR) of 3.6. According to the Reserve Bank, the ICOR for the period from 1990-91 to 1992-93 was a stupendous 6.6; that is, new investment of Rs.660 crore yielded an annual output of Rs. 100 crore during the three-year period covering reform initiatives. Noting the 83 per cent spurt in investment requirement, the Reserve Bank states in its latest annual report: "While a high ICOR in a single year of low real income growth is understandable, a continuing high ICOR over a number of years is worrisome." In plain words, a decline in output in a single year, because of, say, sudden import compression measures, is one thing; but stagnation of output is quite another, especially in a period of rising investment. According to the Reserve Bank, as a proportion of GDP, investment was 21 per cent a year in the eighties; it rose to an annual 23 per cent during 1990-91 to 1992-93.

India has thus put vastly more investment, in the erstwhile Soviet style, to get substantially less additional output. The disconcerting ICOR "underscores the need for a concrete plan for increasing productivity in the economy", states the Reserve Bank. By this, it can mean one of two things: get more output from investment—but that is precisely what reform set out to do; put an industrial policy in place, setting out what to do, in which sector and how —instead of leaving matters to the invisible hand. It is unfortunate that the Reserve Bank has fought shy of spelling out what it means.

The horrendous rise in ICOR shows that reform has gone awry. Weak demand has resulted in excess capacity; clearly the stimulus of devaluation has not directed idle capacity into production for export. Is infrastructure then the bottleneck? Staggered public sector outlays have resulted in incomplete investment which yield no output. Perhaps a substantial part of private investment has gone into replacing plant and machinery; extra output—net of what used to be derived from scrapped investment—is small in relation to investment. Besides, has investment really increased? Devaluation has raised the cost of imported capital equipment; the additional investment, therefore, does not finance correspondingly larger real assets. There are several possible explanations for the runaway ICOR; these need to be identified and grappled with to tackle the reform-retarded economy.

Government To Import 100,000 Tons of Palm Oil

BK2209140093 Delhi All India Radio Network in English 1230 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] The government has decided to import 1 lakh tons of palm oil for the public distribution system. The imports will be made through the State Trading Corporation. The government has also decided to reduce the permissible stock limits of edible oils. Announcing this at a news conference in New Delhi today, the civil supplies minister, Mr. A.K. Anthony, said that decisions have been taken to stabilize the prices of edible oils, which showed a rising trend. He said the government will also sell food grains to the open market selectively. The state governments have been asked to take stringent action against unscrupulous traders for exploiting the consumer, causing unwarranted price hike, especially in view of the truckers strike, Mr. Anthony said.

ISRO Explains Cause of Setback in Launching PSLV

BK2209164593 Delhi All India Radio Network in English 1530 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] The setback to the first developmental flight of the Polar Satellite Launch Vehicle, PSLV, was attributed to the pitch disturbance at the third stage ignition. A preliminary report of the Indian Space Research Organization, ISRO, issued at Bangalore today said all events have occurred as predicted till the third stage ignition. An unexpected disturbance seen around the separation of the second stage changed the pitch attitude of the rocket in the third stage. As the result, the required upward velocity could not be given to the rocket inspite of the excellent performance of the third stage motor and hence it could not reach the distance as predicted.

Iran

Tehran Not To 'Interfere' in PLO-Israel Deal

LD2309084993 Tehran IRNA in English 1854 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] Vienna, Sept. 22, IRNA—Secretary of the Supreme National Security Council (SNSC), Hojjat ol-Eslam Hasan Ruhani said here today that Iran neither intends to take action against the PLO- Israeli deal nor to interfere in the affairs of the process, but is not optimistic of it.

Questioned by the Austrian Press Agency on possibility of military interference of the Organization of the Islamic Countries (OIC) in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Ruhani said: "I do not think Islamic states will launch military interference in Bosnia, but, they are ready to dispatch forces there under supervision of the United Nations.

He also rejected reports of Iranian forces fighting on the side of the Azeri army in the Karabakh conflict, and said Iranian forces did not cross the Iran-Azerbaijan borders and Iran has no military presence in that republic.

The only work that Iran has done is setting up a refugee camp near the common borders with the approval of the Azerbaijan Government, to provide relief to displaced Azeris.

Experts Assembly Condemns 'Humiliating' Accord

LD2009161693 Tehran IRNA in English 1545 GMT 20 Sep 93

[Text] Tehran, Sept. 20, IRNA—The Assembly of Experts issued a statement here today condemning the recent Yasir 'Arafat-Tel Aviv compromise. Declaring full support for the Palestinian people and their intifada, it said: "At this sensitive juncture it is a duty of the Muslim world to confront this dangerous initiative. World Muslims and Muslim governments should foil this humiliating agreement by marshaling their resources and putting their trust in divine power."

In related news, the committee for support of the Islamic revolution of Palestinian people, also issued a statement here today denouncing the Gaza-Jericho plan as "a beginning of a new chapter of great betrayals." The committee which was set up some two years ago after an international conference on the struggles of the Palestinian people, said that 'Arafat was seeking his personal interests by signing the agreement with the Zionist entity.

Raja'i-Khorasani, UK's Burton Review Human Rights

LD2009155993 Tehran IRNA in English 1424 GMT 20 Sep 93

[Text] Tehran, Sept. 20, IRNA—Iranian and British officials discussed human rights topics as well as issues of mutual interest here today. Chief of the Majles human

rights committee, Sa'id Raja'i-Khorasani outlined to assistant undersecretary of the British Foreign Office, Michael Burton, the dimensions of human rights in Islam.

He said that based on the Constitution, religious minorities in Iran enjoy equal rights with their Muslim compatriots. "The Islamic Republic Constitution guarantees economic, trade, cultural and judicial freedom to the religious minorites, including Jews, Christians and Zoroastrians," added Raja'i-Khorasani.

UN Bosnia Tribunal Faulted for Lacking Muslims

LD2009182593 Tehran Voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran First Program Network in Persian 1630 GMT 20 Sep 93

[Text] At today's session of the officials of the Judicial Branch discussion continued on the revision of the bill concerning the formation of public courts. It was decided that the amendments proposed by the justice minister should be passed on to the judicial committee of the Majles.

Mr Yazdi, chief of the Judicial Branch, at the meeting, criticized the step taken by the UN General Assembly in appointing the judges of the international tribunal for Serbian war crimes. He said: the non-inclusion of Muslim judges in the said judicial team and the justification of Western governments and Russia for not apointing Muslims who volunteered is a contravention of international norms as well as a clear reminder of the unfair and unjustifiable political confrontation with Islam. The appointments call into question the international reputation and credentials of the judicial team.

ICO 'Silence' Over Somalia 'Bloodbath' Scored

NC2009125693 Tehran JOMHURI-YE ESLAMI in Persian 12 Sep 93 pp 1, 15

[Editorial: "Endorsement of the Criminal"]

[Text] U.S. Marines in Somalia have started a bloodbath and are hunting down men, women, and even innocent children. The scale of this crime has expanded such that in one case, 450 people, including 150 defenseless men, women, and children, were killed or wounded. Events in Somalia are different from the initial propaganda that was disseminated and the initial mission the relief forces supposedly had. These forces entered Somalia on the pretext of helping the hungry. But for some time, their main mission has been to perpetrate savage crimes; no mention is made of any assistance.

The United States leads this great crime. It perpetrates any crime it wants with the UN banner in its hand.

The United Nations and the Security Council were expected to criticize such savage acts. Although some U.S. allies in this disgraceful military expedition have dispensed with the idea of helping the United States with these crimes, the Security Council, regrettably, and while endorsing the crimes perpetrated by the United States and its allies, also backs these savage acts continuing on the pretext of helping the hungry in Somalia. Naturally, the international community should pressure the Security Council to stop its support, to investigate the scale of the tragedy in Somalia, and to try and punish the "criminal" for its crimes.

The question that should be asked is: On what basis does the Security Council endorse these savage acts?

Are the Security Council news and information media not accomplices to the crimes? Can't they act as reliable and trustworthy sources to reflect the scale of the crimes?

It is logical to expect the Security Council and the United Nations to form an investigative group to go to Mogadishu to study the disgraceful record of U.S. activities in this part of Islam and to submit a reliable report on the scale of the organized Muslimnocide there.

We would like to speak to Pakistan, which, as an accomplice to the United States in these disgraceful crimes, keeps its forces next to the U.S. forces and, according to reliable reports, under U.S. command. Clearly, the Pakistani Government was at first unaware of what was going on. But now, the continuing presence of the Pakistani solders in Somalia is unjustifiable. When Washington's European allies are settling their accounts with the United States and Somalia one after the other so that they will no longer be accomplices to this crime, the question is: Why doesn't Pakistan do the same?

Islamic circles' silence, especially that of the Islamic Conference Organization [ICO], should also be considered. The question is: Why is the ICO silent about the savage massacre of oppressed Muslims in Somalia by the U.S. executioner? Isn't this silence tantamount to endorsing Washington's crimes? If not, this silence should be broken to protest these crimes. This is the simplest thing that can and should be done.

* RESALAT Examines Current U.S. Stance

93LA0221A Tehran RESALAT in Persian 19, 21, 22 Aug 93

[19 Aug p 3]

[Text]

Part 1

Today, there is no longer news about the problems of the East and West, and dealing with problems of the North and South is also difficult, because the interests of these two groups basically advance on two divergent courses. At present, the problems of the East and the West, even more than in 1980, have become the most critical issues of U.S. foreign policy. It cannot be said that the Reagan-Bush foreign policy advanced U.S. interests in this area more than the foreign policy of Nixon, Ford, and Carter, the earlier presidents. Bill Clinton, the current U.S. President, has promised to revitalize production in the United States and, through measures such as reforming the national health system, expects a better social base for individual income. The success of Clinton in this area, much more than has been admitted openly, will depend on a change in

U.S. foreign policy regarding relations with the West and the West [as published]. The issue is quite simple. At the present time, compared to the 1960's, economically, politically, and culturally, the United States has much less power. Meanwhile, Europe and Japan have become relatively more powerful.

Here the purpose is by no means criticism. The cause of the shift of power is structural, not one of error and mistakes. In determining policies, a structured plan is to the advantage of the one who enters the arena later. After 1945, in terms of industrial power, Western Europe and Japan had to reach the status of the United States, which had come out of World War II unscathed. Arriving late on the scene of an expanding world economy (such as the situation after 1945), always due to, for example, the arrival of newer machinery and a relatively cheaper skilled work force, creates the possibility for a leap in production.

Another structural factor was the cost of the "leadership" of the world. The U.S. desire for domination cost a great deal. Government expenditures increased in all areas. The United States made huge investments to develop weapons and preserve a military apparatus at great expense throughout the world. This country shouldered a great portion of the war expenditures of the world, either directly or indirectly, among which Vietnam was most exhausting. The United States also invested in its allies. But, Germany and Japan during this period never faced comparable political-military expenditures.

In addition, the United States bought its national unity at a relatively high price. From 1945 to about 1970, a great deal of attention was paid in the United States to the actual increase in wages. Indeed, workers' unions played a role in this regard. But in exchange for receiving higher wages, they guaranteed that there would be no strikes, a guarantee that was implemented to a great extent. During this period, little attention was paid to the development of the sector that can be called middle management. Lack of attention to the expansion of this management sector resulted in the failure of the wages of workers to increase between 1970 to 1990, and the operational expenditures of companies, while the wages of this sector continued to increase. In fact, according to the statistics of the International Labor Organization, in 1990, the ratio of administrative and managerial jobs to total jobs in the United States was three times this ratio in Germany, Japan, or Sweden, a ratio that was doubled during 1970 to 1990. Parallel and in connection with this development, the specialized service industries for the management sector also expanded. The specialized strata include physicians, attorneys, psychiatrists, stock brokers, restaurant owners, and the like. The prosperous appearance of the United States (at least for educated young people with high-level jobs), directly or indirectly, meant the rise in production costs in the United States compared to production costs in Western Europe and Japan. In these countries, costs also increased, but at a much slower rate. The cost of production in these countries may reach that of the United States, but this will take at least two decades.

The inequality in the growth of production power continually increased between the United States and Western Europe and Japan in the 1970's and 1980's and caused the United States to have much less capability to confront world economic problems. The recession in the world economy for several decades, which was first presented as a theory by a Russian economist named N.W.D. Kundatov, harmed the United States more than its Western allies. This period of recession, which is characterized by decreased world profits, financial crises throughout countries, and increased unemployment, has continued since about 1970. These conditions are quite contradictory to the economic development after the war, which included the most significant increase in world production and welfare in contemporary history.

There are three reasons for the inability of the United States to implement significant steps to eliminate this inequality between the East and the West: The profit-seeking goals of middle management (and specialists that offer them services), the deeply popular belief that the United States would never fall from its position of leadership in the world, and the continuation of the existence of the Soviet Union.

It is appropriate to explain these three problems of the U.S. Government. "Profit-seeking goals" has become an insulting phrase in the United States, which is used incorrectly. But some of the goals and interests are actually profit seeking. The political responsibility for the huge budget deficit of that country does not belong to the single mothers who live on welfare, it is the fault of all those who have benefited from certain government practices and policies, such as defense contracts based on inflated prices and the tax exemptions during the Reagan presidency. Middle management and the specialist service sector top the list of those who have benefited from these conditions. For this reason, it has been impossible to prevent the draining of the budget politically and might not be possible for some time to come. Whether spending tax revenues or borrowed money, the effect on the competitive (production) ability of the United States has been the same.

In the United States, avoidance of the issue that the United States has declined is very common, and this is quite understandable. For a long time, the national myth of the United States has been the promise of progress and prosperity for everyone. The first decades after World War II were the period of meeting this promise. It took a long time for Americans to fully appreciate their own good fortune. They created in themselves the supposition that they live in the land of God. Although this belief is an affront to religious ideas, it is not a belief that one can easily abandon.

Of course the (existence of the) Soviet Union justified every action. The United States was the necessary and required leader of a free world, which was in a life-and-death struggle against an evil empire. Reagan was ridiculed for using this phrase, but by using this phrase, he expressed a deep and common emotion. We might be able to study the myth and realities of the cold war consciously

and rationally, but, in any case, as long as the Soviet Union existed, neither would the United States abandon its global political role, nor would Western Europe and Japan want the United States to actually do so. This meant that the United States could not assume a realistic position against its Western allies.

Hence, despite the actual decline of U.S. power in the 1970's and 1980's, the United States tried everything to preserve its domination. Nevertheless, the problems were real, and for this reason, the government was forced to prepare tactical plans to fight, if not the actual decline at least the perceived decline.

[21 Aug p 3]

[Text]

Part 2

Situational Solutions

So far, we have witnessed the implementation of two of these tactical plans: One was prepared and created by Nixon, which was essentially continued by Gerald Ford and Jimmy Carter, and the other was the Ronald Reagan plan, which was continued by Bush. Both of these plans faced historical defeats, because in both cases they resulted in temporary relief at the price of making the basic conditions more critical.

The fundamental Nixon doctrine was a rhetorical retreat. It was Nixon who, for the first time, addressing the Americans, announced that the bipolar world was about to crumble and change into a multipolar world. It may seem strange to say that Nixon, a person who started his political career with fiery anticommunist rhetoric, was trying to gain fame as a politician who founded the rhetorical retreat. But he did precisely that. And the fact that the world did not praise him for this action may be the basis of the feeling that no one has understood him, a feeling that does not end with Nixon.

He did all that politically might have seemed impossible for a Democratic president. He retreated from Vietnam. He declined cessation of hostility with Leonid Brezhnev, the Soviet leader, and met Mao Tse-tung, the leader of China. Hence, he brought the United States, a little more consciously than we think, into the decade of the symptoms of the "post-Vietnam" syndrome. In regards to the major issue, that is, the relations with Western Europe and Japan, the main idea was based on "trilateralism," meaning that Western Europe and Japan be allowed, if they accept the continued U.S. "leadership," to participate in decisionmaking. The goal was to lead Western Europe and Japan in this direction, so that they would not go more than they should after the concessions due to their increasing power, because U.S. domination, as a protective shield against the Soviet Union, was still necessary for them.

Trilateralism had results, but only up to a point. Western Europe and Japan actually stopped their claims, or one might say postponed their claims, until a more appropriate time. Trilateral institutions were created, the most important of which were the conferences of the heads of the seven large industrial countries, which started with the help of Valerie Giscard d'Estaing, the French president (at the time). But since the goal of "trilateralism," like other tactical plans, was based on the rhetorical retreat and preservation of U.S. domination, despite its actual weakening, U.S. foreign policy in the 1970's was essentially not coupled with will and determination. It gave concessions with one hand and took them back with the other.

When Carter came to power, he emphasized the same trilateral rule, but also added to it a rhetorical fight concerning human rights, and, considering Carter's characteristics, in this regard, he was much less a hypocrite than Nixon. This combination turned out to be explosive. In Afghanistan, Brezhnev violated the laws of the cold war, even though this action by the Soviet Union was not actually considered a serious threat, because, as we can see clearly now, the Soviet Union was cutting its own roots. In the South, a more explosive situation arose. In Iran, with the hope of the coming to power of a "moderate" government, which, considering the severity of the harnessed anger of the people, was a futile hope, Carter could not prevent the fall of the shah. He confronted Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeyni, a person who had his own moral purity and was determined to prove the weakness of the paper tiger of Carter and his evil empire, that is, the Great Satan, the United States. The United States slipped, Carter fell, and Nixon's tactical plan began to shake.

The policies of Nixon, Ford, and Carter, with the efforts to postpone the decline of (the power of) the United States, but without interest in creating real changes, resulted in a great geographical cultural defeat. The United States was shamed in a manner worse than the Vietnam defeat. At least in Vietnam the United States had fought. The blows to the United States in Iran were humiliating and included the crash of helicopters in the desert, the reconstruction of shredded CIA documents, and the captivity of diplomats.

Now, it was Reagan's turn and time for Tactical Plan No. 2. Reagan's analysis was quite the opposite of Nixon's. He claimed that decline of the United States was false, but it was a rhetorical retreat. His proposed response to this problem was a verbal show of force along with military "hostility" and a short-term plan for the sudden improvement of the economic situation and political frightening of the world once again.

The bullying tactics of Reagan had results, always and everywhere, but in a particular manner. Western Europe and Japan, even though they were becoming increasingly restless, continued to show patience and tolerance until a more appropriate time. The economy of the Third World countries crumbled, and this meant that there would be no sign of Vietnams and Cubas. But since the willpower of the United States had decreased, this situation reached a dead end. The bombing of Libya and the invasion of Grenada cannot be described as the significant points of a bullying policy. Reagan's retreat from Lebanon after 241 U.S. military personnel were killed, and that despite his open

leaning towards attacking Nicaragua he never dared to do so, are among the factors that showed the actual limitations of the United States.

Had Reagan actually frightened the Soviet Union? One can hardly respond in the affirmative to this question. The phenomenon of Gorbachev was a domestic reaction to the decline of U.S. power, not to the continuation of that power. "Gorbachev's actions" were an effort to safeguard the Soviet Union and the Communist Party from the threat of destruction. In fact, in the relations between the United States and the USSR, in which the life of one depended on the existence of the other, there was not enough dependence to be able to prevent the disintegration of the Soviet Union.

Even though the fall of the communists throughout the Eastern Bloc was like the answer to a prayer, it was considered a full-blown tragedy for the Reagan-Bush tactical plan. Although they shouted a great deal and threatened the rival, they never expected the house of the rival to crumble from its very foundation. The confusion of Bush at the time of the crumbling of the empire is proof of this claim. The goal of their plan was to harness Western Europe and Japan by relying on the Soviet danger and threat. Without this threat, the United States no longer had an excuse to not allow its allies, which had been its practical rivals for 20 years, to follow their own interests without fear.

The invasion of Iran on Kuwait, which was quite far from the geopolitical victory of the United States, aimed the last nail into the coffin of the "bullying" planner. The coalition, which the United States headed, actually defeated Iraq militarily, and for that matter significantly, and on television. But the world learned two basic facts from the experience of the (Persian) Gulf war.

First, Saddam Husayn dared (to do such a thing). For the first time since 1945, a country had intentionally provoked the United States into military action. No one tries to stand up, face-to-face, to a domineering power. North Korea did not think that the United States would go to war in the Korean Peninsula. Cuba, Libya, and Vietnam had all fought against the United States, but all essentially wanted to be left alone. They did not try to confront the United States. But Iraq did precisely this, and in doing so, showed that the United States is no longer a domineering power, but is merely a military giant. Let us not forget that when Bush left the presidency, Husayn was still in power.

The second point is that, even though the United States, as a giant in motion, was able to unite almost everyone on the same line to overthrow Saddam Husayn, it did not have the capability to provide for its costs. The major portion of this cost was paid by the four countries of Germany, Japan, Kuwait, and Saudi Arabia. The message hidden in this event did not remain hidden from anyone. The Reagan military bondage legacy consists of the United States presenting itself to the world as an imposed mercenary that carries out the police actions of the United States and asks others to pay for it. In the long term, this position may be considered perhaps more humiliating than the captivity of the "U.S. diplomats" in Tehran.

[22 Aug pp 3, 5]

[Text]

Part 3

The End of the Domineering Era

Clinton sees that in the course of foreign policy, he is at a pivotal point, similar to the conditions that Franklin Roosevelt confronted in 1933. Roosevelt also was elected on a domestic policy platform and placed priority on the internal affairs of the United States. But foreign policy won over his presidency and historical legacy.

Roosevelt had to persuade the Americans with sweet talk and stroking to abandon their historical isolationism and accept their "responsibilities" in the world. Now, Clinton must persuade the Americans with sweet talk and stroking that the period of gleeful domineering has ended and will never return. The United States has to accept the fact that it is only one of the major powers among several great powers in a very disorderly world, with disorder and confusion that are going to escalate for a long time into the next century. In the domestic arena, no president in the United States can perform miracles in the area of foreign policy, but there are things that he can do.

Clinton must start his work by abandoning the Nixon and Reagan plans on the basis of trying to accomplish an impossible task, that is the continuation of the domination seeking of the United States, and to replace these plans with an implementable foreign policy. This foreign policy must pursue U.S. interests in the same way that other great powers act: with definite goals that conform to long-term realities in terms of the power and capability of the country. Clinton should neither pursue rhetorical retreat nor the rhetorical show of force. Rather, he must pursue a more realistic method.

After deciding on such a foreign policy, the United States must adjust its relationship with Japan, China, and France. This does not mean that other countries are unimportant. The rest of the countries are also important, but the United States must reach an agreement with these three countries. Resolving its differences with others, at least with (the countries in) the North, will be easier. But if the United States does not reach an agreement with the three above-mentioned countries, this alone will be sufficient to make the task of the United States to change the economy, which is necessary, very difficult. This issue will also have domestic consequences, because in this case, the resources will need to be directed into several scattered courses, and during the period that it requires, it will face defeat.

At present, all evidence and signs point to the leadership of Japan in the economic arena. During the period of global economic recession in the next five years, the first goal of governments will be to reduce the side effects of the recession. Japan's governmental budget in comparison

with that of its rivals has a stronger base; consequently, this country will have fewer problems providing for its domestic social expenditures. During the period of 25 years, which will follow this period, and it is likely that the global economy will expand under the influence of the dynamics resulting from the relatively monopolized new major industries, the most important effort of the great economic rivals in the world will be to the create conditions that will result in their turning into the centers for the accumulation of world capital. In the 1980's, Japan made the most effort to gain superiority in innovations in the major industries of the future.

At least in the past 10 years, the United States has tried to encourage the Japanese to do things that did not clearly guarantee their immediate economic interests. On the whole, Japan has refused to do so. For what reason should it now agree to this? Those who bash Japan have not realized that if avenging actions are taken, if the United States is not harmed more than Japan, it will at least be harmed as much as Japan, because as much as the United States needs Japanese capital, Japan needs U.S. markets.

That country must find another solution. U.S. and Japanese companies must be allowed to move on their natural courses, towards close industrial partnerships, which will preserve jobs in both countries and, in fact, will result in increased employment. We must consider this partnership not as a marriage of love but of convenience. Like all such marriages, the conditions of the contract must be carefully worded and spelled out.

Under such an arrangement, what can Japan offer? Before all else, not to put the United States aside. In the trilateral rivalry in the early 21st century (between the United States, Western Europe, and Japan), the possibility exists that the United States will rank third place. Being a partner to a winner is much better than being third.

In the past two decades, the Japanese have displayed an astonishing capability and capacity for innovation in the production of various goods with a high degree of applicability. Considering the shortcomings and deficiencies in U.S. management, in the future, the Japanese are most likely to continue to do much better in this area than the Americans. If the U.S. Government does not stop open tensions with the Japanese on the commercial arena, U.S. companies will directly engage in making arrangements (to trade) with the Japanese. The Japanese will respond to this action, because they would very much like to preserve their access to the U.S. market (and soon the North American Free Trade Agreement market). Moreover, the Japanese want to increase their economic power vis-a-vis Europe.

Nevertheless, the U.S. Government must not merely step aside, because, we must ask, other than the U.S. market, what other dowry will the country bring along? In the next 30 years, Japan will need the United States for two reasons, the first of which is U.S. military power. Given recent history and its consequences in regards to the Asian understanding, and considering the internal political situation of Japan, an increase in the military power of Japan will be slow. Of course, at the present time, Japan is not threatened with many military dangers. However, until the two Koreas have united in some way, Japan will be worried about the existence of a possible danger in this peninsula, and the unity of these two countries will create new worries. In any case, Japan will want a sort of lasting military guarantee from the United States.

The second thing that Japan needs the United States for is access to "research and advancement" in that country. In terms of scientific organization, the United States has the clear superiority and will preserve this superiority for some time to come, even though this gap will decrease over time. Unfortunately, the Reagan bondage has had a direct negative effect on American (scientific) research and advancement. To put it simply, the statement that investments in projects such as the "Strategic Defense Initiative" will have the best results in nonmilitary production technology is not true. For the same money to be invested in industries that are on the front line of growth and development would significantly reduce the production superiority of Japan. Reagan's military strengthening expenditures, by putting increasing pressure on the federal and state government budgets, resulted in a decrease in investment in education. If the U.S. Government does not significantly invest in revitalizing the universities and the research capability, and then in preserving and continuing them, by the year 2000, the United States will have no dowry left to offer.

Among the three major countries that we mentioned, it is easier to reach an agreement with Japan than the others. In the relationship (between the United States and Japan), clearly mutual interests are the issue. Surprisingly, perhaps because of the cultural differences (and not despite these differences) between these two countries, there will be fewer psychological conflicts. But China is quite a different story. Today's China, which contains one-fifth of the world population, has been humiliated, and the two countries that have humiliated it are first Japan and then the United States.

Of course, China fought it. The revitalization of this country was the result of national reuniting by the Chinese Communist Party. The Chinese Communist Party, contrary to the communist parties in Eastern Europe or Russia, was a manifestation of Chinese nationalism. It is often said that the present leadership in Beijing wants China to join the world market in a more active way, provided this action will not impose fundamental political change on this country, in other words, peristroyka without glasnost (reconstruction without the open political climate). But this is not really true. It seems that Beijing wants all the advantages that production brings for the world market (only) provided that this action will not cause the disintegration of China. Kwangtung Province, which for a long time, through investments by Hong Kong and Japan, has mingled with the world market, has shown signs of "regionalism" for a long time.

The expansion and development of the U.S. and Japanese economies in the 21st century need China as a market, a production region, and a force for political stability. China is needed as a market, because the basis of the expansion of

the global economy is in effective increase in demand, and the sellers markets of Japan and the United States are, in a sense, at the point of saturation. China is the next logical arena. China is needed as a production region, because wages, even in the "Four Dragons" and Southeast Asia, are rising rapidly. In the next 20 to 30 years, wages in China will not reach these levels. And, finally, China is needed as a force to establish political stability, because progress and development are projected on the basis of the existence of stability in the production regions and major markets, and the instability of China will create unrest and crisis all along the coasts of the Pacific Ocean. If in the future, in making (necessary) arrangements to establish the "Pacific Ocean Coast," China is disregarded, such a region will find competition with Western Europe difficult. The European Community may face problems at the present, but in a few years these problems will most likely be a faint memory.

China also hopes to follow this course, but the leadership of that country (to choose this course) will ask a price. China will need a real guarantee: the guarantee of national unity. Along with national unity comes the issue of recognition as a major power on the world arena. China is very proud. This country wants to sense the real respect of others. Neither is a visit by the emperor enough, nor are three joint communiques one after another by the United States and China, communiques that are practically forgotten in the United States. China must be brought into the decisionmaking center of the world and not treated as a potentially dangerous agent for the spread of nuclear weapons. China wants to be part of the "West," not the "South."

In regards to France, in the 20th century world, no other two countries have had such a love-hate relationship as has existed between the United States and France. In 1992, the two countries quarrelled noisily about some sort of oil seeds. Certainly, the influential groups supporting the farmers in both counties are so irrationally strong, but do countries go to war against each other, even a trade war, over oil seeds?

The real issue is by no means agricultural subsidies. Of course, this is a complex and troublesome issue, but it is the kind for which, first, one can always find a compromise and, second, except for countries that directly benefit from it, is essentially unimportant. The main issue between France and the United States is the European army.

The United States has essentially opposed European unity. In the 1950's and 1960's, this country enthusiastically supported all steps that were taken for Europe. The United States looked at this unity as a political front against the Soviet Union. Moreover, the United States wanted to prevent any sort of protective economic policy in Europe, because this policy would harm U.S. exports. The United States especially encouraged France and Germany to reconcile, because it considered this reconciliation a basic condition for the rearming of West Germany. The United States also hoped that the Germans would moderate France's unhappiness with U.S. leadership, and this policy was successful.

But in the 1970's and 1980's, other ideas occurred to the United States, and the worry was created that a united Europe would create a powerful rival for the United States, even though no one, especially the Western European politicians who were close supporters of the two shores of the Atlantic Ocean (the United States and Europe), wanted to admit it. But at the end of the 1980's, European unity against the United States was taking shape. The United States sensed this, and for this reason, its opposition started on this course more strongly. When the Danes voted negatively in the Maastricht treaty of the European Community concerning economic and political unity, there was mischievous joy in Washington, and Margaret Thatcher had powerful allies, if not supporters, in the United States.

Here, NATO was an important issue. It is not clear what NATO, which was a cold-war instrument, is good for. It is quite clear that what is happening in the former Yugoslavia, or what occurred in Kuwait, by no means depends on NATO. With the elimination of the Soviet threat, the real interest of the United States in NATO is to prevent the formation of a true European army by France and Germany. But this policy is meaningless, because it cannot succeed. The United States must stop its prevention of the creation of a European army and allow NATO to be gradually eliminated.

The true unity of Europe will have many benefits for the United States. First, in a truly multipolar world, neither will the United States nor others expect the United States to resolve all disputes and interfere everywhere. Considering that the United States no longer has any actual power, is it not better for these expectations to end? Second, the United States, by stopping its policy of preventing the advancement of European goals, will show that it is truly ready to treat Europe as an equal political partner. And in this whole issue, France is the main key. If France and the United States are able to reestablish their close historical relationship, the rest of the European countries will welcome it and follow the same course. In the next decades, the United States will have enough problems in confronting the serious economic rivalry of Europe, and under such conditions, it by no means needs the heavy burden of European hatred (for the United States), which has stemmed from the prevention of the growth of Europe during the period of U.S. domination.

In order to be able to compromise with Japan, China, and France, the United States must first come to an agreement and understand that it is no longer at the height of its power. Obviously, a new position in the area of foreign policy will not solve all the problems of that country throughout the world. In fact, the greatest problem, that is, the increasing economic and population polarization of the South and the North, will remain unsolved, the problem that today the United States confronts with deceptive slogans, such as opening up markets, nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, and human rights. But this is another issue. At least as long as the United States accepts that its world base of power has decreased, it can once again be verbally powerful without relying on retreat or a

show of force and, for this reason, enjoy the respect of other countries. This will be effective in restoring the dignity of the United States. That is what it has lacked for the past 20 years.

* U.S. Strategy Seen Motivated by Domination

93LA0227H Tehran KEYHAN-E HAVA'I in Persian 18 Aug 93 p 8

[Article by 'Ali Taqavi: "'Creating Enemies'; America's Strategy for Continuing Its Leadership of the Capitalist World"]

[Text] The overthrow of the socialist bloc and the collapse of the Soviet Union [as published] not only meant the eradication of one pole in the international bipolar system, it also created a breach in the strength of the other. During the almost 50 years of the cold war, the United States was considered the only power resisting what was called "Soviet expansionism," and thus, in view of its military and economic superiority, it was the leader of the Western Bloc. Although the destruction of the Eastern Bloc and the Soviet Union was considered the greatest victory for the capitalist camp led by the United States, it also brought about important changes within this camp. Germany achieved unity, and Western Europe moved towards solidarity. The result of all this was the emergence of several economic powers such as Japan, Germany and also France to some extent as a political power, against America. The collapse of the Soviet Union in particular brought the philosophy of America's power and leadership into question.

Although the "new world order under the leadership of the United States" has been the long-term strategy of the White House since the beginning of the 1990's, the reality is that the collapse of the Soviet Union as a mutual threat for the capitalist nations has now made highly questionable the acceptance of Washington's leadership of the Western world on the part of the world's powerful capitalist nations, and these nations no longer see any reason to follow America without question. This reality is even reflected in American society, in such a way that the Americans preferred to elect a government that is more concerned with domestic affairs.

Despite all this, White House officials have not yet been able to understand the new international realities well and adjust their policies of the last half-century. The policy-makers in Clinton's government believe that its dream of leadership of the world and the new world order is already a reality. In seeking to realize this goal, the United States has sought to find a replacement for the former Union of Soviet Republics and create a commotion about the "enemy" in order to be able to gather the Western nations around it once more in solidarity and to profit from the benefits and privileges of this leadership.

In recent months, in the quest to "create enemies" for the purpose of regaining its role of leadership in the Western world, Clinton and other White House officials such as Warren Christopher and Martin Indyk have repeatedly mentioned the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Islamist groups in Sudan, Somalia, Lebanon (and Islamic fervor in general) as threats to the new world order. Without a doubt today Islamic fundamentalism is considered the main opponent of the West's quest for domination, and its number-one target is the interests of the United States of America. However, Washington's reaction to this has been such that it must either be called hysterical and ill-conceived or something that has been thought out with another factor in mind, a factor that is nothing other than the effort to perpetuate the leadership role of world capitalism. Moreover, it appears that the United States is also seeking to portray its main international problem (the Islamic revival) as Europe's most basic problem at this time in order to make use of the capabilities of the Europeans in this regard.

In this same connection, James Baker, former American secretary of state, announced: "The end of the cold war and the collapse of the Soviet Union does not mean that the world is more secure, because dangers such as Iran's quest for power are still a threat." He named other dangers such as the government of Saddam Husayn, North Korea and unrest in Russia and Central Asia, and he said that Europe is incapable of solving these problems. The conclusion that Baker draws from his claims is that "America must remain the world's superpower." The reality, however, is that the changes in the world have now taken on a direction that does not reflect unquestioned world leadership for the United States, just as the United States' insistent demand that its allies cut their ties to Iran has produced no result.

Moscow-Ankara Moves, Caucasus Situation Viewed

NC2109095793 Tehran ABRAR in Persian 11 Sep 93 p 2

[Unattributed commentary: "Central Asia—The Common Viewpoint of Russia and Turkey"]

[Text] At the end of her visit to Moscow, Turkish Prime Minister Tansu Ciller said in a news conference that from now on, Moscow and Ankara will cooperate instead of compete in Karabakh.

The Turkish prime minister made clear reference to Russia's dissatisfaction over her country's past policies in the region, and added that there is no need for these policies to be continued.

The Turkish prime minister's remarks are being made at a time when Elchibey—Turkey's favored pawn in Azerbaijan—lost his last chance with the negative vote he received in the recent referendum.

In the Moscow talks, the two sides emphasized that regional security is not possible without Turkey and Russia and that both countries should send peacekeeping forces to Azerbaijan.

At a time when the Armenians have occupied a major part of Azerbaijani territory and 100,000 Azerbaijanis have been ousted from their homes, the Moscow talks were more a political gesture than a peace-seeking effort.

In addition to the economic aspect, Russia—which considers itself the heir of the disintegrated Red Empire—regards the Caucasus region as a strategic channel.

During the past months when Russia was involved in a domestic power struggle and economic problems more than at any other time, it welcomed Geydar Aliyev coming to power in Baku. Moscow believes that a change in leadership in Baku will result in a further concordance between the two countries. Therefore, it was waiting for an opportunity to seize the political initiative in Karabakh.

However, with Geydar Aliyev's arrival, Turkey lost out on all the economic-political investments it made in the last two years and all of Ankara's efforts to reinstate Elchibey's power failed.

However, apart from regional aspects, the cooperation between and the joint viewpoint of Russia and Turkey have an international aspect as well.

—Both countries need Western economic assistance;

—Both countries lack new economic structures for a dynamic presence in Central Asia;

—Both countries lack popular support in the Central Asian republics.

Therefore, the cooperation and joint viewpoint of Moscow and Ankara on the Karabakh crisis constitute a new pressure lever that is being forged with the green light that has been given by Aliyev on joining the CIS and on inclining toward Moscow, and the Russians can use the experienced Turkish lobby in the West to find new friends.

However, in view of the harm that has been done by the Karabakh crisis, regional security cannot be solved without a comprehensive agreement; and undoubtedly such an important plan cannot be implemented solely through talks between the two countries.

Regional security is a policy that goes beyond talks between two countries and is based on cooperation among all regional countries; and a fresh effort by Moscow and Ankara without cooperation by a country like Iran cannot be successful, just as many plans in the Persian Gulf have remained mere ink on paper.

The conclusion drawn from the Moscow talks is that Turkey has a vital need for Central Asia, especially Azerbaijan. Therefore, Ankara will not give up. Under such conditions, our country's regional foreign policy should be based on achieving peaceful cooperation and dual containment of the Armenians and the Azerbaijanis, and on clarifying the meaning of regional security for Moscow and Ankara. The Islamic Republic's diplomacy should be implemented in such a way that it is not considered incapable of peace-seeking efforts; unfortunately this is what is gleaned from the Moscow talks.

The role of the Islamic Republic of Iran in the region is undeniable even if Ankara and...[ellipses as published] do not want to believe it.

Events in Russia, Yeltsin Position Analyzed

LD2209150493 Tehran Voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran First Program Network in Persian 1110 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Unattributed commentary]

[Excerpts] In the name of God, the compassionate, the merciful. Good day dear listeners.

Following the intensification of political differences between Boris Yeltsin, president of Russia, and that country's parliament last night, Yeltsin appeared on Moscow television and announced his decision to dissolve parliament and stage parliamentary elections in December. Parliamentary deputies reacted strongly to this decision and, in a retaliatory move, the deputies swore in Aleksandr Rutskoy as acting president. [passage omitted].

Yeltsin's decision, which he himself says sprang from an effort to rescue Russia from political anarchy and disintegration, was supported fully by American President Bill Clinton and leaders of a number of EC member countries, as well as some other European countries. Inside Russia, the Ministry of Defense declared its impartiality and members of the cabinet declared their support for the president.

In reality, Boris Yeltsin's decision to dissolve the Russian parliament should be counted as the last phase in the intense struggle for power between him and his opponents. In recent weeks, signs of new coalitions were fast emerging among Yeltsin's opponents—consisting of parliament, Rutskoy, and some other opposition political forces—and in keeping with this same trend, by appointing new people to the posts of the security and economic ministers, Yeltsin endeavored to remove the crippling obstacles standing in the way of his economic and political reforms. In the past few months, all efforts to achieve a basic agreement between the two sides have been unsuccessful; both sides in this struggle for power in Russia are being drawn more and more toward more radical positions. The country's political and economic crises have spread in an unprecedented manner, and each of the two sides have reappeared on the scene with the intention of eliminating the other instead of attending to all the crises. This phenomenon itself has contributed to the intensification of the crisis. During the past few months, the war of words and politics between Yeltsin and parliament—led by Ruslan Khasbulatov—acquired new dimensions and parliament blocked the ratification and implementation of the economic reforms that Yeltsin had in mind. For instance, parliament dismissed key figures in economic reforms such as Yegor Gaydar, formulator of the reforms and former prime minister of Russia, and refrained from approving the country's budget and laws pertaining to private ownership in Russia. This was effective to the extent that international aid and loan donor organizations, that is, the IMF and the World Bank, in the past few days suspended payments of their next loans to Russia.

From the point of view of opponents, Boris Yeltsin, who has had his disputes with parliament for some time now,

by announcing that he was dissolving parliament has in reality trampled underfoot all existing laws, notably the Constitution. In spite of this, it seems that Yeltsin intends to act above the law by relying on his election by the people and his popular approval in last April's referendum. He intends to carry out this move within the framework of national interest and beyond existing institutions which, in his opinion, are left over from the communist era. He is apparently a leader who finds it very difficult to contain himself within the confines of the law. His potential as a political leader manifests itself better when he adopts a harsh and heroic gesture in the political struggle.

In spite of this, Yeltsin's confrontation as the head of the executive power with the legislative and judicial powers has created a great split in the government. It is difficult to imagine how this can be mended without the forced removal of one of the two parties to the dispute.

We shall probably witness some important developments in the political scene in Russia in the coming hours. These developments will have a determining effect on the destiny of the Government of Russia and the current reforms. The essential factor in this matter is which side the people of Russia will support in the present crisis.

Russia currently has two presidents, and its parliament is convening its session when it is not clear whether it has any legitimacy. Yeltsin, who hopes for the support of the West and Westerners, especially America, in this power struggle may possibly find it difficult to use this support as a political lever to win the power struggle. Preparations are currently under way to convene the Congress of People's Deputies which is the ultimate body for deciding on the authority of the president and parliament. If this congress cannot take a strong decision then the political crisis will definitely further deepen.

Further on Visit by Indian Prime Minister Rao

Khamene'i, Rao Discuss Kashmir

LD2209133293 Tehran Voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran First Program Network in Persian 1030 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] His Eminence Ayatollah Khamene'i, leader of the Islamic revolution, this morning received Indian Prime Minister Narasimha Rao.

At the meeting, which was also attended by President Hashemi- Rafsanjani and the foreign ministers of the two countries, referring to the economic and political potentials, conditions and capacities of the two countries, the esteemed leader said: India is our natural and historical friend. The Islamic Republic of Iran has always been interested in the fate of that country. Therefore, the two countries could have extensive relations in various spheres.

Stressing the importance of safeguarding the rights of Indian Muslims, the esteemed leader expressed regret about the action taken by Hindu extremists in destroying Babri Mosque. He pointed out to the Indian prime minister the importance of rebuilding that mosque for Muslims.

The esteemed leader made a kind reference to Indira Gandhi, the former Indian prime minister, for her efforts to safeguard the rights of Muslims in India and to harness the hostile feelings of Hindu extremists. He said the destruction of Babri Mosque, years after the death of Mrs. Gandhi, is testimony to her invaluable role.

Referring to the hurt inflicted on the feelings of Muslims by the destruction of Babri Mosque, he said: The Muslims of India are part of the population of that country and their fate is that of the Indian nations. However, because of the commonness of Islamic feelings and holiness, the action of the Hindu extremists in destroying Babri Mosque deeply hurt the feelings of Iranian Muslims and other Muslims in the world.

The leader of the Islamic revolution said the destruction of religious places for vain reasons is unfathomable and is condemned. He stressed that the Muslim world expects Narasimha Rao to rebuild Babri Mosque. The esteemed leader described Babri Mosque as a symbol of the long presence of Islam in India.

Continuing his speech he voiced to the Indian prime minister his heartfelt concern about the pressure put on Muslims in Kashmir by the military. He referred to the historical and natural ties between India and Iran. To Narasimha Rao he said: The present situation of Muslims in Kashmir is regarded as unsuitable for India, as an outstanding country and a friend of the Islamic Republic of Iran. It is expected that this issue will be resolved in the best possible manner.

His Eminence Ayatollah Khamene'i described the valuable role played by Mr. Rao as an experienced politician in safeguarding unity and solidarity among the people of India. He said that it is a grave responsibility of the Indian Government to harness prejudiced and extremist sentiments in that country to prevent further damage.

Narasimha Rao stressed his government's adherence to the model of government set by Mrs. Gandhi. He said: We regret the destruction of the Babri Mosque. The case will be dealt with in a court, and the Indian Government will execute the court's verdict. Already legal proceedings have begun against those responsible for the destruction of the mosque.

The Indian prime minister referred to the equality of all religions and ethnic and lingual sects before the Indian state. He also submitted a report to the eminent leader about the steps taken by the Indian Government after extremist Hindus attacked and destroyed the Babri Mosque. Some of these steps included dissolving the local government, and dismissing the perpetrators of the incident from the central government.

Moreover, he referred to the presence of a large Muslim population in India, and considers his country to be part of the Islamic world. He stressed that at present, more than

anything else, his country needs social reforms in order to harness unexpected tensions.

Narasimha Rao also met and conferred with Majles Speaker Nateq- Nuri today.

Rao Addresses Majles Session

LD2209140693 Tehran Voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran First Program Network in Persian 1030 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Excerpts] Indian Prime Minister Narasimha Rao, together with his entourage, attended today's open session of the Islamic Consultative Assembly and gained some insight into the activities of our country's legislative power. We draw your attention to our correspondent's report in this connection:

[Unidentified correspondent] In his speech at today's open session of the Majles, the Indian prime minister considered lasting bonds between the nations of Iran and India as the most important element in the two countries bilateral ties. [passage omitted] The Indian prime minister said: Indian Muslims constitute one of the largest Muslim communities and play an important role on India's economic and political scenes.

Mr. Rao considered his meetings with the eminent leader and the president of our country as very constructive and useful. He expressed the hope that these meeting would create a greater momentum in the expansion of friendly relations between Iran and India. This is because firm ties between the two countries will help establish stability and security in the region, and will facilitate its development and progress.

After remarks by Mr. Rao, Majles Speaker Nateq-Nuri thanked the Indian prime minister and his entourage for their presence in the Majles session. He then considered what the two countries have in common as a source for more cordial relations and more extensive cooperation. He added: The two countries can incease their comprehensive cooperation in the transfer of technology and also in the social, economic, cultural, educational, and industrial spheres.

The Majles speaker referred to the presence of more than 200 million Muslims and the importance of the Persian language in India. He considers these facts as significant reasons for greater cooperation. He added: The membership of both countries in the Non-Aligned Movement [NAM] provides a large arena for political and international activities, and for the expansion of ties between Iran and India.

Nateq-Nuri referred to the efforts made by the world's domineering powers to impede the growth of other world countries, and the influence exerted by these powers over international forums and organizations. He stressed the need for more action and dynamism by the NAM. He also stressed the Islamic Republic of Iran's respect for the independence and territorial integrity of other countries, and for nonintervention in their internal affairs. He said: As an Islamic country, the Islamic Republic of Iran cannot be indifferent toward the Kashmir issue and the Muslims of that region.

He expressed hope that, through greater harmony and consultation, the dispute between India and Pakistan over Kashmir will be resolved. He also expressed the readiness of the Islamic Republic of Iran to offer any kind of cooperation to resolve the Kashmir issue.

The Majles speaker also said: I hope that with the right ideas of the head of the Indian Government, all the problems of the Indian people, in particular that country's Muslims, may be resolved.

President Comments on Rao Visit

LD2209191693 Tehran IRIB Television First Program Network in Persian 1530 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] At the conclusion of the Indian prime minister's visit to Iran it was announced that the two countries have decided to expand bilateral relations to the highest level. Our correspondent reports:

A memorandum of understanding was signed between the two countries' officials at the concluion of the visit to Tehran by Mr. Rao. In an interview with the Central News Unit, Mr. Rao termed the outcome of his visit to our country as very positive, and said: The government of India has found better motives for expanding its relations with Iran in all fields. Considering the existing mutual understanding, the government of India will now hold more consultations with Tehran on international issues. The Indian prime minister said: We have made some satisfactory plans to expand the two countries' economic relations and we have decided to hold more parliamentarian contacts. Overall we can say that we were more successful than we expected and I hope that our relations reach the highest point.

President Hashemi-Rafsanjani, speaking on the outcome of his talks with the Indian prime minister, said:

[Begin recording] In the name of God, the compassionate, the merciful. India is a very important country for us. Considering India's great deal of sectarian and religious differences and other problems, as well as its great population and size, it has good records, experience in postindependence reconstruction, self- sufficiency policies, and a deep-rooted democracy. We have never concealed our desire to expand cooperation with India. It also accepts that Iran is one of their good Asian partners. The visit took place with that viewpoint. The two sides left all fields open to any form of discussion. We spoke on international and regional issues and the two countries' relations in all fields. We have many common viewpoints. There are very strong grounds for cooperation between the two countries, which were registered in our discussions, and we have made preliminary agreements on them. Both his excellency and I think that following this visit our cooperation will take a step forward in all areas. Considering the huge Muslim population of India we envisage that our people will want to expand cooperation with the people of India, and

therefore the private sector can also become a partner in that task. The Indian Parsees are particularly very interested in cooperation with Iran. I thank Mr. Rao for taking the trouble to visit Iran and pave the way for further cooperation. [end recording]

Rao Says Visit 'Successful'

BK2309005893 Delhi All India Radio Network in English 1530 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] India and Iran have called upon all nations of the region to refrain from supporting terrorism and subversion directed against any other country. Both the countries felt that noninterference in internal affairs of other countries is the fundamental principle for peaceful coexistence. They agreed that the atmosphere conducive to negotiated settlement of all outstanding issues should be created in the interest of overall peace and stability.

In a joint communique issued at the end of the three-day official visit of the prime minister to Iran, both the countries also called for maintaining peace and tranquility in the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf region. They are to speed up the feasibility study for laying pipelines from Iran to India for setting up of a fertilizer plant in Iran and for technical collaboration in the field of oil and gas. They have agreed to collaborate in development projects and in construction of ports and roads, and laying rail lines and air links. India and Iran also signed two memorandum of understanding for cooperation in the fields of science and technology, and surface transport and transit facilities.

Addressing the Iranian parliament—Majles—today, Mr. Narasimha Rao said that a stable and close relationship between India and Iran will contribute to the stability, security, and progress in the region. He said that the two nations share the determination to achieve social progress and political stability on the basis of people's will.

The prime minister called on President Rafsanjani for another round of talks today. Several cabinet ministers called on the prime minister, Mr. Rao, and discussed bilateral matters. Mr. Rafsanjani has accepted Mr. Narasimha Rao's invitation to visit India.

Earlier, Mr. Narasimha Rao had a 45-minute audience with the Iranian spiritual leader, Ayatollah Khamene'i, in Tehran. Ayatollah Khamene'i told Mr. Rao that Ayodhya and Kashmir issues are internal matters of India and said that he has full confidence in the ability of Mr. Rao to solve them amicably.

The prime minister has since left for home at the end of his three-day visit to Iran. He was seen off at the Tehran airport by the Iranian president, Mr. Hashemi-Rafsanjani, and the foreign minister, Mr. 'Ali Akbar Velayati. In a brief interview to our correspondent Avinash Goel at the airport, Mr. Narasimha Rao said that his visit is successful beyond his expectations. He said some projects in the economic fields are likely to take shape in the near future.

Joint Statement Issued

LD2209194593 Tehran IRNA in English 1851 GMT 22 sep 93

[Text] Tehran, Sept. 22, IRNA—Iran and India in a joint statement issued today urged world countries not to interfere in the internal affairs of one another and observe the principle of peaceful coexistence.

The statement, released at the end of a 3-day official visit to Tehran of Indian Prime Minister Narasimha Rao, underlined the importance of peace and tranquility in the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean regions.

It said both Iran and India believe that regional governments should have active cooepration in this regard.

Both countries called for impartial international measures to be taken for disarmament and elimination of weapons of mass destruction throughout the world.

The two countries also announced their willingness to cooperate in surface transportation and provide each other with facilities for transit of goods and in implementing infrastructural projects pertinent to railways, roads, oil, gas, petrochemicals and telecommunications.

The joint statement said the two sides have discussed the laying of an oil pipeline between Iran and India as envisaged in a letter of understanding signed by their oil ministers and setting up a fertilizer plant on Iran's Qeshm Island.

Iran and India has also agreed to cooperate in transfer of technology, exchange of college students and professors and of cultural delegations, and to consolidate bilateral cultural cooperation through establishment of friendship groups.

Indian Foreign Minister Meets Velayati

LD2209204993 Tehran Voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran First Program Network in Persian 1030 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] Indian External Affairs Minister Dinesh Singh, met Mr. Velayati, our country's foreign minister, this morning.

At the meeting the foreign ministers discussed relations between Iran and India, cooperation in international matters, and the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean situation. In view of the common denominators and interests of Iran and India, they stressed the importance of cooperation between the two countries in matters relating to safeguarding security and stability in the region.

At the meeting, referring the recent events in central Asia, the Indian foreign minister expressed the willingness of the Indian Government to cooperate with countries in that region. He stressed the importance of Iran's role in the matter.

Velayati Issues Warning on Disputed Islands

PM2209160793 London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT in Arabic 19 Sep 93 pp 1, 4

[Unattributed report: "Velayati Warns Against Harming Iran's Sovereignty Over Islands"]

[Excerpts] Tehran, London, AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT—A radical change has occurred in the tone of the statements emanating from official political circles in Iran regarding the dispute with the United Arab Emirates [UAE] over the three islands of Abu Musa, Tunb al-Kubra, and Tunb al-Sughra, as Iran has warned that it is entitled to use military force to defend its national sovereignty, which it said extends to include the three islands.

The warning came in a speech delivered by Iranian Foreign Minister 'Ali Akbar Velayati before a gathering of military commanders on the occasion of the annual conference of the Revolutionary Guard commanders in Tehran.

Official Iranian sources say that Iran has reinforced its military presence and tightened its grip on its islands throughout the Gulf, that is, a total of 24 islands, including the three islands which are the cornerstone of the dispute between Iran and the UAE.

In his speech Velayati emphasized that "the three islands belong to Iran and will remain so, on the grounds that they are an integral part of national sovereignty."

He added: "Any attack targeting the three islands by any foreign power will bring nothing but regret, distress, and grief for the attacking forces." [passage omitted]

Velayati's warning came as an indication of Iran's unwillingness to draw up a comprehensive settlement of the islands issue in the foreseeable future. And it seems that the Iranians sought to keep the dispute over the islands' sovereignty away from the media in the hope of reaching a form of bargaining between the two sides via secret diplomatic channels. This kind of political approach was subjected to sharp criticism, especially from hardliners inside the Iranian leadership, who stressed the need to first deploy Iranian forces on the islands' borders and then begin to get negotiations under way on Iranian terms. Velayati left the option of returning to the negotiating table open, as he emphasized his country's willingness to discuss some of the practical issues concerning conditions for the UAE citizens wishing to stay and work on the territory of Abu Musa island.

In his speech Velayati said that the Iranian side is completely willing to hold a dialogue on the real issues. He warned that "the quarters expecting Iran to concede part of its national territory and hand it over on a silver platter are pursuing a method full of dangers."

President, Germany's Kohl Discuss Bilateral Ties

LD2209192193 Tehran IRIB Television First Program Network in Persian 1730 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] German Chancellor Helmut Kohl and our country's President Hashemi-Rafsanjani tonight held a telephone conversation discussing ways of expanding bilateral cooperation.

According to a Central News Unit report, Mr. Hashemi-Rafsanjani thanked the German chancellor for his efforts to pave the way for the expansion of the two countries' relations and said: We hope to witness further improvements in relations between Iran and Germany with the exchange of political and economic delegations. We hope the two countries will be able to perceive a bright future in a friendly and sincere atmosphere, particularly during the course of Iran's second economic and social development plan, and based on realities and the two nations' interests.

Mr. Hashemi-Rafsanjani referred to the problem of Bosnia- Herzegovina and said: We hope that Germany continues its efforts toward the restoration of the rights of the Muslim people of that country as it has done in the past.

The German chancellor also expressed satisfaction at the growing trend of Iranian-German ties and said: We support the expansion of the two countries' relations particularly in the field of trade and the economy and believe that both countries and the region benefit from it.

Mr. Helmut Kohl expressed the hope that, following the visit to Iran of the German economic minister to Iran, the way is paved for the expansion of bilateral economic cooperation.

The German chancellor expressed support for the people of Bosnia- Herzegovina and said: We always want to support the right, and stop the violation of the rights of that region's nations. We will make further efforts in that regard in the future.

Communications Firm To Use German Software

LD2209195293 Tehran IRNA in English 1859 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] Shiraz (Fars Prov.), Sept. 22, IRNA—The Iranian Telecommunications Company (ITC) will utilize software technology according to a six million DM [Deutschmarks] contract signed with the German Siemens Company, said ITC general manager, Valiullah Rezvani here today.

The software technology, he added, will enable ITC to make changes in the present digital systems and also design new systems.

Rezvani said that software technology will help his company keep other industrial and administrative sectors abreast of the latest technical knowhow and offering them the required services.

President Marks Anniversary of War With Iraq

LD2209194293 Tehran IRNA in English 1843 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] Tehran, Sept. 22, IRNA—President Hojjat Oleslam 'Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani here Wednesday paid a personal tribute to the armed forces for blunting the Iraqi invasion war which started this day in 1980, and said that because of their heroic defence no power will ever dare to repeat Baghdad's folly.

President Rafsanjani who was addressing a large gathering at the Azadi Square on the first day of 'Sacred Defence Week' commemorating the eight-year sacrifices of the Muslim combatants, said Iran's armed forces had in fact neutralized a conspiracy shaped against the Islamic Republic by the global arrogance, the Zionist regime and reactionaries.

This "unholy triangle", he said, views the Islamic revolution as a threat to its existence and spares no efforts to undermine it.

However, he added, the resistance shown by the armed forces and the people of Iran against foreign invasion proved that because of the solidarity of the people and due to their unity with their leader the country's enemies would fail in their challenges to Iran no matter how great and mighty they may be.

Rafsanjani said although during the war years the Islamic Republic was able to block the Hormuz Strait and thereby make the Persian Gulf unsafe for international shipping it elected not to do so.

But, he noted, the Iraqi regime's conduct of the war greatly differed and basically included the bombardment of cities, use of chemical weapons, targetting of economic installations and maltreatment of the prisoners of war, all of which were ignored by the Western media.

According to the president the bold resistance by the people of Iran during the war years with Iraq was crucial evidence of the fact that the people are committed to the aspirations of the Islamic revolution to their last breath.

He referred to the last public mobilization in Iran during the acceptance of United Nations Security Council Resolution 598, and said that contrary to the Iraqi regime's view, Iran had not agreed to the resolution from a position of weakness but rather by way of heeding what the father of the Islamic revolution, Imam Khomeyni, and the ranking officials in the country thought it wise for the government, as the grand mobilization of forces showed.

Hojjat Ol-eslam Rafsanjani expressed hope that the armed forces of the country would now seize the peacetime opportunities for contributing to national construction projects in whatsoever capacity as they can.

He also paid tribute to the martyrs of the Islamic revolution and made a special mention of their relatives for their unflinching firmness in their Islamic ideals despite the pains of the loss of their dear ones.

Khamene'i Urges Attention to 'Sacred Defense Week'

LD2009165093 Tehran IRNA in English 1622 GMT 20 Sep 93

[Text] Tehran, Sept. 20, IRNA—Leader of the Islamic revolution Ayatollah Seyyed 'Ali Khamene'i on Monday underlined the need to mark in an appropriate manner the Iranian Muslims' defence of their ideals against international encroachment, in an appropriate manner. The supreme leader was referring to Iran's sacred defence during the 1980-88 war imposed on it by the Iraqi regime with the support of global arrogance.

"The reality of the imposed war was not restricted to the attack by one country on another country, but it was actually an international conflict imposed on a nation which was defending a holy cause and truth," he pointed out. The ayatollah said that reports on national and patriotic wars is the most obvious part of the history of every nation because they indicate the true nature of that country.

He also stressed on the importance of publishing books and screening films in connection with the Iraqi imposed war, and of offering reliable statistics on Iranian military operations, during the sacred defence week (September 22-28).

Reza'i on Strategy for Defense Self-Sufficiency

LD2009170293 Tehran Voice of the Islamic Republic of Iran First Program Network in Persian 0930 GMT 20 Sep 93

[Excerpts] On the occasion of the Holy Defense Week the first seminar reviewing Imam Khomeyni's thoughts on defense began in Tehran today, in the presence of a number of state political and military figures. [passage omitted on Ahmad Khomeyni paying tribute to his father]

Addressing the seminar, Sardar [title given to guard commanders] Major General Mohsen Reza'i, commander in chief of the Islamic Revolution Guard Corps [IRGC], analyzed the country's defense and military potential. Referring to the special thoughts of the founder of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Reza'i referred to some [Koranic] verses and the remarks and statements issued by his eminence the imam [Khomeyni] on the need to maintain a balance of power. He stressed: One of the objectives of the Islamic revolution is to realize the self-sufficiency of the Islamic Republic's armed forces. For if we cannot stand on our own feet without relying on others, we would not be able to make any move.

He also presented some statistics on the situation of the world armed forces and expressed the hope that the armed forces' headquarters in the country will cooperate with the Defense Ministry in studying comprehensive strategies for achieving military self- sufficiency.

* Leader of Islamic Movement Party Interviewed

93LA0227A Tehran KEYHAN-E HAVA'I in Persian 21 Jul 93 pp 22, 23

[Interview with Mohammad Sharif Hematzadeh by KEYHAN-E HAVA'I, place and date not given]

[Text] Tajikistan is the first of the newly independent nations of the former Soviet Union to experience the secret expansionism of the noncommunist government of Russia led by Boris Yeltsin. With obvious intervention on behalf of the communists, Russia toppled Akbarsho Iskandarov's independent government and replaced him with Imamali Rakhmanov. During this change the Islamic and democratic parties were subjected to the harshest attacks and

thousands of people were driven from their homes, killed and imprisoned. What follows is an interview KEYHAN-E HAVA'I recently did with Mohammad Sharif Himatzada, leader of the Islamic Movement of Tajikistan, during a trip to Tehran.

[KEYHAN-E HAVA'I] Disputes have been reported among the members of the ruling council in Tajikistan. Over what issues are these disputes?

[Himatzada] The essential difference of opinion arises over the question of whether the current leadership of the Republic of Tajikistan came to power with the support of criminal armed groups. In 70 years of communist government, government officials and relations have mainly been in the hands of residents of the north, while the current government has reached power relying on forces from the Kulab area in the south. In one of his recent speeches, [?Yahya'ov], the current speaker of parliament, said: Our people were killed, we shed our blood and we took power, but they (the residents of the north) do not want us to hold any offices or positions.

Thus when it was time to divide power, the armed groups did not observe geographic proportion. Regional differences consequently developed and they will remain from here on. Today the so-called people of Kulab and the criminal armed groups have taken power. The speaker of parliament, the most accursed of all, and the minister of the interior choose the officials on the National Security Commission, government officials, and other officials with sensitive positions from their ranks. This dispute will remain and will lead to an explosion within the government.

[KEYHAN-E HAVA'I] It is said that killing of Sangak Safarov (commander of the forces who brought the current government to power) happened as a result of the regime's internal conflicts. What is your view of this question?

[Himatzada] The killing of Sangak Safarov, another of the military commanders of the armed groups, took place in a way that shows the result of the internal disputes and struggles in the Tajikistan regime. As far as we know, first Sangak Soghraf shot Faizali Saidov and then the supporters of the one murdered killed Sangak Safarov. Of course the killing of these two by their own people is no surprise, because they really are a group of criminals and thugs. Moreover, the thing that is to be done by them, meaning the overthrow of Islamic and national forces, has been done. Perhaps there was no longer any need for them. In any case, they had to be eliminated. Therefore, just as Aleksandrovich, the famous Russian scholar and orientalist, predicted, they eliminated Safarov according to plan. Of course, in view of the existing situation, anyone could have made such a prediction.

[KEYHAN-E HAVA'I] What is the current situation like in the government of Tajikistan?

The government's situation is still unstable and there could be a war at any moment between the regime's internal factions. An emergency situation has thus been declared in the country and an effort is being made to disarm the various factions in the government with the help of the Russian army because weapons in the hands of a group of criminals and thugs is dangerous both for the citizens of the republic and the government. The country is now restive, and the way the current communist government treats its opponents is like the behavior of the communists at the beginning of their rule during the Stalinist period. Executions without trials and purges of the opposition continue in the republic, and of course it is natural that this situation will be followed by a reaction. A large number of the people of Tajikistan have left the country and taken refuge in Afghanistan because of these killings and savage attacks. In view of these methods, it must be said that the communist government in Tajikistan has no future.

[KEYHAN-E HAVA'I] Currently what is the situation with the Islamic and national forces, including the Islamic Movement Party, the Democratic Party, the Resurrection Party, and the other parties?

[Himatzada] The planner of all the incidents and wars with the Islamic and national parties was the communist party, which armed criminal and convict groups. Now these people are being called national heroes and are naming cities and villages after them. Unfortunately the supporters of the Islamic and democratic parties did not have the military organization, weaponry and readiness for war, while the opposition groups were sufficiently prepared and received special support from Uzbekistan. The Islamic and democratic groups rose in defense solely to protect their lives, property and the honor of the people. Of course, after the arrival of the Russian and Uzbek forces these groups were unable to continue the resistance and therefore many people were killed or driven from their homes. To stop the bloodshed, we agreed to compromise with the government that came to power in Dushanbe to establish security, but they refused because plans were made outside the country, especially in Uzbekistan, to destroy the democratic Islamic forces. Our forces are now continuing a guerrilla war in the mountains of Tajikistan because they know it is suicide to surrender to the communists. In every place the communists have occupied, including Dushanbe, they have carried out killings and executions without trial.

[KEYHAN-E HAVA'I] The current government in Tajikistan claims that it has destroyed or nearly destroyed all the national Islamic forces. What is your view of this government claim?

[Himatzada] When it came to power in December 1991, this government intended to destroy all the opposition groups within a week or two, but it has not yet been able to do so, and we believe, God willing, that it will not be able to do this. The opposition forces say that the acceptance of the government's existence has caused the killing of opposition forces. We therefore no longer officially recognize the government. Armed struggle is now taking place in most of the mountain areas, and it is reported that along with the government forces, the forces of the nations with common interests, especially Russia and Uzbekistan, are also fighting the combatants.

[KEYHAN-E HAVA'I] References to Tajikistan as a second Afghanistan by some Russian circles indicates that the Russians fear Tajikistan becoming another killing ground for their soldiers. What is your view of this?

[Himatzada] This comparison is correct in two respects. On the one hand, like the Soviet forces, who destroyed, burned, and leveled Afghanistan, they are doing the same thing to Tajikistan. The mountains, which are the base for the popular and Islamic forces, are being heavily bombed by the air forces of Russia and Uzbekistan, and it is reported that they have destroyed many villages and rural areas. On the other hand, as in Afghanistan, the Russians in Tajikistan are facing national and Islamic forces, and Moscow must have learned from what happened in Afghanistan. Some political circles in Russia now think that helping the communists in Tajikistan is a mistake and it has become clear to them that these people are just a group of criminals. I must note that in 1917 also the communists in Tajikistan came to power with the help of thugs.

[KEYHAN-E HAVA'I] Has any particular party or group from the national forces formed a coalition and alliance with the government?

[Himatzada] The common goal brings us together and today the communist terrorists in power are attacking all the popular, democratic, and Islamic forces. The communists have not only attacked the Islamic forces, they have also attacked popular and democratic forces, intellectuals, and every person with national inclinations. In view of these things, all the aforementioned forces have united against the terrorist government of the communists.

[KEYHAN-E HAVA'I] In your view, why did the relatively democratic conditions disappear that came about in Tajikistan after Rahman Nabiyev stepped down, under which all the political forces in Tajikistan set out to live together?

[Himatzada] After Rahman Nabiyev resigned, Iskandarov, the speaker of parliament, was head of the government for more than two months! However, in these two months he was unable to do anything. On the one hand, during this period he was unable to make Russia properly understand the situation in this coalition government in order to change Moscow's position, and on the other hand, from the beginning Uzbekistan was pessimistic about the Islamic, popular, and democratic forces. Therefore, from that time on the Republic of Tajikistan was under embargo, because the paths of contact to Tajikistan passed through Uzbekistan. Iskandarov was not even able to establish a national army to defend his coalition government. When the establishment of the national army was announced many youths volunteered, but forces were not formed during this period that could resist the criminal and thug groups. Thus the communists and their criminal agents established relations with Russia and Uzbekistan and received military help from them. The communists claimed that the president of the republic at that time (Iskandarov) was affiliated with the Islamic groups, thereby persuading the governments of Russia and Uzbekistan not to recognize his government and even to oppose it.

[KEYHAN-E HAVA'I] What were Akbarsho Iskandarov's positions and inclinations?

[Himatzada] Iskandarov was formerly a communist, and before he got into the parliament and then moved to the positions of deputy and president, he was a good staff worker (communist party). Iskandarov's lack of political knowledge and understanding meant that during the time of his government he was unable to get Russia to take a favorable view of him, and his opponents indicated that the government was in the hands of the Islamists, although it was not.

Of course, under Rahman Nabiyev's coalition government, several members of the Islamic parties participated, just as two members of the democratic organizations were also on this cabinet. In any case, there was no Islamic government, either in that time or under Iskandarov, but there was propaganda that the government had fallen in the hands of the Islamists. It reached the point where to deflect the accusations Iskandarov said: "I was, am, and will be a communist."

Despite all this, he was not successful and was unable to allay Russia's fears. Before he became speay had more room to operate, above criticism?

[Himatzada] Of course, as I said, the government was not at all in the hands of the democratic and Islamic forces. Only the propaganda organizations of the West and Russia claimed that the Islamists were inker of the parliament, he was president of the self-governing state of Badakhshan, and that did not last that long either.

[KEYHAN-E HAVA'I] In your view, is the performance of the Islamic and nationalist forces under Iskandarov's government, when the power in Tajikistan. Only a few members of the government were affiliated with the Islamic groups. The reality is that the war began at the beginning of the formation of Iskandarov's coalition government in Tajikistan and Rahman Nabiyev's armed groups began the killing and slaughter in some states. The director and basic instigator of this disaster was Rahman Nabiyev himself. On the one hand he armed criminal groups and set out to slaughter and assassinate the Islamic and popular forces. On the other hand, at his instigation in the states of Kulab and Khajand, the state councils did not officially recognize the coalition government. Thus only Dushanbe and the mountain areas were controlled by the central government. The hands of the government were thus not even free to operate so that now one would be able criticize it and the performance of the democratic and Islamic forces.

[KEYHAN-E HAVA'I] It is said that the behavior of Akbarsho Iskandarov's government towards the people of Kulab was not good and that in reality, this is one of the factors leading to the clashes. What is your view concerning this?

[Himatzada] In my opinion this view is completely unacceptable because the clashes began several months before Iskandarov's government began. Moreover, throughout his tenure and leadership, nothing was done to incite the anger of the residents of Kulab.

[KEYHAN-E HAVA'I] In general, do you think conditions are currently favorable in Tajikistan for the establishment of an Islamic government?

[Himatzada] After 70 years of life under a communist government, rule by two generations and the new generation getting a foothold in the communist government, Tajikistan is in circumstances where it would be difficult to establish an Islamic government and implement Islamic law. Of course, 90 percent of the people are Muslim, but this is not enough to establish an Islamic government. To establish an Islamic government it is necessary to understand Islam and to believe that Islam offers a complete system for human life. That is, Islam not only entails worship, but is also a law for life on the basis of which a human being must live. Unfortunately, although 90 percent of the people are Muslim, they do not have a proper and complete understanding of Islam, and of course the reason for this is also clear: 70 years of life under communist rule is the reason for this ignorance. Therefore one cannot establish an Islamic government in such an environment and climate.

Of course, the establishment of such a government is the aspiration and hope of every Muslim, but conditions are not ready and first one must strive to bring about these conditions.

[KEYHAN-E HAVA'I] What is your program for realizing these aspirations?

[Himatzada] To do this it is necessary to teach and train the people and make them understand Islam. There would be no benefit to taking over the government by force, because it would not be stable. The people must thus be made to understand Islam, and they themselves must call for the establishment of Islamic government.

[KEYHAN-E HAVA'I] What is Russia's current strategy towards the Central Asian republics, especially Tajikistan?

[Himatzada] Naturally, Russia is pursuing its own interests. If the communists were to give up their position to others, they also would pursue their own interests. The Central Asian republics are considered vital and important for Russian interests, because there are many resources and much natural wealth in these countries, and most Russian factories rely on these resources. Hundreds of thousands of workers are employed in these factories. It is for this reason that it is said that the Central Asian republics are infinitely vital and important for Russia. Therefore in each of the former Soviet republics where the spirit of independence arises, the Russians, either with or without an intermediary, create discord, strife and bloodshed, as in the self-governing republic of Chapan, were the people sought independence and announced their separation, and then after that there was much fighting and bloodshed in this republic. In any case, it will take time to achieve full independence outside the sphere of Soviet influence. The structure of the former government has created dependence on Russia. It is therefore not possible to leave the Russian domain in a short time. The reality is that the new republics have not fought that hard to achieve independence, and they achieved their independence easily and at no cost. Consequently, this independence was easily taken back from them one after the other.

[KEYHAN-E HAVA'I] What is the nature of your relationship with the Government of Afghanistan?

[Himatzada] You know that many refugees from Tajikistan are taking refuge in Afghanistan and are living in the north of this country. The Government of Afghanistan has an appropriate position concerning refugees and emigrants and it has put all of its resources at their disposal, especially in view of the fact that as you know, the emigrants entered Afghanistan in the winter season. The Government of Afghanistan has provided the necessary housing, medicine, and food to the refugees. It has given them a place in the schools and government offices and has shown them good hospitality. For this reason, we are very grateful to the government of Afghanistan. Afghanistan's aid was provided at a time when there was unrest in that country and there was fighting in Kabul.

[KEYHAN-E HAVA'I] Currently, what are the conditions for Tajik refugees in Afghanistan and Iran?

[Himatzada] We do not have that many emigrants and refugees in Iran because we do not have a common border with Iran. The republics that surround us to the north, east, and west not only do not give asylum to refugees, but also their security and intelligence organizations arrested a number of Tajiks who left their country and turned them over to the communist government in Tajikistan. It was only possible for the people to go into Afghanistan. Therefore women, children and old people, enduring many problems and with many killed and injured, crossed the river Amu Darya to take refuge in Afghanistan. Of course, some of them, after entering Afghanistan or the other republics, went individually to Iran's embassies and sought asylum in the Islamic Republic, but there are not many of them.

[KEYHAN-E HAVA'I] Do the national and Islamic parties have a plan for the future and to resist the existing situation and the current regime?

[Himatzada] To resist the current situation, the Islamic and popular forces have established unity, solidarity, and coordination among themselves, just as there was previously a coalition among them. The reason for this is also clear, because all the opposition forces have a common enemy. A united front must therefore be formed against this enemy.

[KEYHAN-E HAVA'I] Under the current circumstances do you see military struggle and armed warfare as the way out of this situation, or do you also consider it possible to engage in parliamentary and political struggle?

[Himatzada] It is very difficult to achieve a desirable result through war. We are therefore seeking political solutions and we are seeking to prevent slaughter and bloodshed, and ultimately the destruction of the country, through talks.

[KEYHAN-E HAVA'I] Do you consider political struggle practical or not?

[Himatzada] Neither the government nor the popular and Islamic forces have yet proposed talks and negotiations. The reality is that if the communists had wanted to end the problems through negotiations, they would not have caused all this slaughter and destruction while the way to negotiations and political agreement was still open. Their plan has been to destroy all the national and Islamic forces. In any case, we do not discount a solution through political means and negotiations, and the military solution is not the only path in our plan. We believe that one can also seek to benefit from political methods and talks.

[Himatzada] Thank you for taking part in this interview.

Newspapers Report Official Appointments

* Envoy, Other Officials Named

93LA0227B Tehran KEYHAN-E HAVA'I in Persian 28 Jul 93 p 4

[Text] On the recommendation of the foreign minister and with the approval of the president of the republic, Bahman Taherian-Mobarakeh was appointed special ambassador and fully authorized representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Nigeria.

By order of Dr. 'Ali Larijani, minister of culture and Islamic guidance, Dr. Purnejati was appointed deputy minister for press and propaganda affairs in this ministry and also acting minister for policymaking in cultural affairs, and went to work.

Dr. Mohammad 'Ali Nahafi, minister of education and training, issued an order appointing Dr. Ruhollah 'Alami as his adviser on textbook affairs.

By order of Dr. 'Abbas Manafi, vice president of the republic and chief of the Environmental Protection Organization, the task of supervisor of this organization's planning office was assigned to Mohammad Baqer Saduq. He is now the general manager of environmental protection for the province of Tehran.

* Naval Region I Commander Named

93LA0227C Tehran KEYHAN-E HAVA'I in Persian 11 Aug 93 p 4

[Text] Admiral Shamkhani, commander of the navy of the revolution guards and the army, issued an order appointing Vice Admiral Golvardi as commander of Naval Region 1.

The minister of education and training issued an order appointing 'Ali Reza Taqipur as executive director of education and training in Tehran. Before this he was in charge of the General Office of Education and Training in the province of Mazandaran.

By order of the chief of the Martyr of the Islamic Revolution Foundation, Hasan Karbala'i was made executive director of the National Cultural and Tourist Assemblies Organization.

Engineer Sa'idi-Kia, minister of roads and transportation, issued an order appointing Engineer Seyyed Reza Lesani, deputy minister for railroad technical affairs and operations, as a member of the board of directors of the railroad corporation.

Hamid Reza Mehrazma, railroad deputy for manpower and training, issued an order appointing Engineer Seyyed Hoseyn Shapuri railroad general manager for training.

* Naval Academy Supervisor Chosen

93LA0227F Tehran KEYHAN-E HAVA'I in Persian 18 Aug 93 p 4

[Text] The commander of the navy issued an order appointing General Vice Admiral Hoseyn Sarang as supervisor of the Nowshahr University Naval Science Academy.

* Deputy Ministers Appointed

93LA0227J Tehran KEYHAN-E HAVA'I in Persian 1 Sep 93 p 4

[Text] In meetings with various departments of his ministry, Dr. 'Alireza Marandi, the new minister of health care, treatment and medical education, praised the efforts of the former minister's deputy ministers, and named his own deputy ministers as follows: Dr. Mohammad Reza Kalantar-Mo'tamedi, deputy minister for treatment affairs; Dr. Gholamhoseyn Niknezhad, deputy minister for pharmaceutical and food affairs; Dr. Faridun Nuhi, deputy minister for education; and Dr. 'Abdol-Hoseyn Ruhol-Amin, deputy minister for student affairs.

Likewise, Dr. Baqer Larijani remained as deputy minister for educational, legal, and Majles affairs.

* Further Appointments Noted

93LA0227K Tehran KEYHAN-E HAVA'I in Persian 8 Sep 93 p 4

[Text] On the recommendation of the chief of the Armed Forces Staff, the exalted leader, the commander in chief of the armed forces His Holiness Ayatollah Khamene'i has appointed Brigadier General Sayyad-Shirazi as second in command to the chief of the Armed Forces Staff, Hoseyn Amir-Mo'id was appointed deputy chief for logistics and industrial research, and Brigadier General Guard Commander Izadi was appointed deputy for projects, planning, and budget for the Armed Forces Staff.

By order of the chief of the judicial power, Dr. Hasan Towfiqi was appointed chief of the National Medical and Legal Organization. Prior to this Dr. Towfiqi was Tehran's chief of forensic medicine.

By order of Dr. Marandi, minister of health care, treatment, and medical education, Dr. Faridun 'Azizi, professor at the Martyr Beheshti Medical Sciences University, was appointed as his consultant.

On orders from Dr. Hashemi-Golpaygani, minister of culture and higher education, Dr. Mohammad Hasan Shoja'i-Fard and Dr. Seyyed Ahmad Eftekhar-Hoseyni were appointed as deputy minister for legal and Majles affairs and consultant to the minister on deprived area affairs, respectively.

Yahya Al-e Eshaq, minister of commerce, appointed Mohammad Karimi-Nuri and Dr. Seyyed Mohammad E'rabi as his consultants.

Dr. Seyyed Mohammad Reza Hashemi-Golpaygani, minister of culture and higher education, made the following appointments:

Dr. Fathollah Moztarzadeh was appointed deputy minister for research.

Dr. Ebrahim Sana'i was appointed deputy minister for administrative and financial affairs.

Dr. Mohammad Soleymani was appointed deputy minister for student affairs.

Engineer Mohammad Ahmadi-Nezhad was appointed consultant for cultural and social affairs.

Seyyed Hoseyn Fasihi Langrudi was appointed general manager of public relations.

Likewise, by order of Dr. Shoja'i-Fard, deputy minister of culture and higher education for legal and Majles affairs, Reza Jame'i was chosen as this ministry's general manager of Majles affairs.

The public relations office of the Ministry of the Interior reports that six of this ministry's deputies have been selected by 'Ali Mohammad Basharati, minister of the interior, as follows:

Hojjat ol-Eslam val-Moslemin Seyyed Sadr ol-Din Shari'ati was appointed deputy minister of legal and Majles affairs.

Engineer 'Ali Reza Tabesh was appointed deputy minister for political and social affairs.

'Ali Akbar Rahmani was appointed deputy minister and chief of the National Registry Organization.

Rasul Zargar was appointed deputy minister to coordinate development affairs.

Mohammad Amin Sazgar-Nezhad was appointed deputy minister for administrative and financial affairs.

'Ali Qiyam'iun was appointed deputy minister for projects and planning.

* Envoy to Bosnia Named

93LA0227I Tehran KEYHAN-E HAVA'I in Persian 25 Aug 93 p 4

[Text] On the recommendation of the minister of foreign affairs and with the approval of the president of the republic, Mohammad Javad Asayesh, Iran's ambassador to Zaghreb, was appointed Iran's accredited ambassador in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

'Abdol-Hoseyn Vahaji, minister of commerce, issued an order appointing Ahad Kazemi supervisor of the General Office of Commerce for the province of Ardebil.

By order of Engineer Kazeruni, minister of housing and urban construction, Engineer Abol-Fazl Sum'elu was appointed general manager of housing and urban construction of Ardebil.

By order of the cultural deputy of the University Crusade, Seyyed 'Ali Akbar Hashemi was appointed as official in charge of the permanent secretariat of the National University Students' Art Exposition.

By order of Engineer Mohammad Sa'idi-Kia, minister of roads and transportation, Engineer Gholamreza Keramati was appointed general manager of roads and transportation for the province of Zanjan, and went to work.

It is necessary to explain that the above appointments took place before the official end of president of the Republic Hojjat ol-Eslam Hashemi-Rafsanjani's first cabinet.

Pakistan

Spokesman Comments on Kashmir Situation

BK2209145693 Islamabad PTV Television Network in English 1400 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] In Islamabad, a Foreign Office spokesman, describing the situation in occupied Kashmir as grave and daunting, said today Pakistan hopes India is now ready toward the implementation of the Security Council resolutions on Kashmir. He was referring to a recent interview of the Indian foreign secretary, Mr. Dixit, in which he had reaffirmed that India still stands by the United Nations resolutions on plebiscite in Kashmir. The Foreign Office spokesman hoped that quick progress could be made toward implementing these resolutions. The spokesman said Mr. Dixit has offered the Indian version of what is required to implement these resolutions, but, he said, Pakistan does not agree with [word indistinct] excuses that Mr. Dixit has offered. The agreement on the implementation process can be reached through bilateral or multilateral talks, he said.

Expressing Pakistan's concern toward the deteriorating human rights situation in occupied Kashmir, the spokesman said we would continue our efforts to highlight the issue of Kashmir. He said human rights situation in occupied Kashmir and Jammu and Kashmir deserve the attention of the world community, and Pakistan aspired a resolution by the United Nations on human rights abuses in the occupied territory. The conscience of the world

community can no longer ignore these human rights violations and actions are required by the international community to compel the Indian Government to cease the massive violations of human rights.

The spokesman welcomed the UN secretary general's reference to the Jammu and Kashmir problem in his annual report. In reply to a question on the Iranian offer of mediation on Kashmir issue, the spokesman said Iranian Deputy Foreign Minister Mr. Ala-ed-Din Borujerdi is due in Pakistan tonight and will hold talks with Pakistan officials on various matters.

India Reportedly Agrees to Talks

BK2309024993 Islamabad Radio Pakistan Network in Urdu 0200 GMT 23 Sep 93

[Text] According to reports, India, while reacting to the UN secretary general's appeal to settle the Kashmir dispute, has said that it is ready to begin a dialogue with Pakistan based on the Simla agreement. ASSOCIATED PRESS OF PAKISTAN reports from New York that Indian Minister of State for External Affairs Dinesh Singh held talks with UN Secretary General Butrus-Ghali for 30 minutes. This meeting took place a day after the United Nations chief submitted his annual report to the General Assembly, drawing the attention of the international community to the Kashmir dispute.

The 48th session of the General Assembly began in New York on Tuesday. After the meeting, the Indian minister informed newsmen that the UN secretary general made the offer of his readiness to use his good offices to help Pakistan and India resolve the Kashmir issue, if both countries are willing.

Need To Counter India's Foreign Policy Moves Seen

BK2209124793 Islamabad THE NEWS in English 22 Sep 93 p 7

[Editorial: "The Imperative To Counter India's Move"]

[Text] Indian Prime Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao has arrived in Tehran at the head of a high-powered delegation and the visit comes more or less on the heels of his trip to Beijing which the Indian media described as extremely successful. During the visit to the People's Republic of China, Rao managed to conclude an agreement with Mr Li Peng's government to ensure non-aggression vis-a-vis their border dispute. The PRC trip, thus, marked the first step forward in relations between the two countries that were soured in the early sixties and resulted in the outbreak of hostilities. Thus, it would not be surprising if New Delhi seeks a similar fillip in its relations with Tehran. There are two aspects of Mr Rao's initiative that need to be examined. The first, of course, does not raise alarm bells anywhere. Under pressure at home whether on account of the BJP [Baharatiya Janata Party] onslaught or the Harshad Mehta scandal, the Indian premier may just be trying to seek relief in his foreign policy "successes".

However, in the context of geo-political realities in the region, it is imperative that considerable significance be attached to the Rao initiative. Although Pakistan's ties with both the People's Republic of China as also the Islamic Republic of Iran are based on concrete and unshakeable foundations, it would be in New Delhi's strategic interest to try and drive a wedge between Islamabad, on the one hand, and its two staunch allies on the other. It apears that the Indian prime minister is also taking advantage of the fact that Pakistan is poised to go for elections and the whole foreign policy decision-making apparatus, like the rest of the government policy-formulation organs, may be unable to respond quickly to challenges at this point in time.

An additional factor that needs to be examined are the defence-related implications of the Indian moves. When the Soviet trops pulled out of Afghanistan, the General Headquarters (GHQ) of the Pakistan Army heaved a sigh of relief because the Western borders had been rendered almost secure. This secured frontier thus created a reserve force for deployment, in case of any emergency, on the eastern borders. This aspect was viewed by defence analysts as a major deterrent in the face of any aggressive designs by Islamabad's monstrous eastern neighbour. However, with India's agreement with China, defence experts feel, New Delhi would be free to redeploy at least two mountain divisions in the first phase alone.

Given the backdrop of the popular uprising in Indian-occupied Kashmir, this military relief is not without significance. While Pakistan need not worry where its time-tested friendship with the PRC and Iran is concerned, there can be no room for complacency. Whatever measures are necessary for ensuring national security and territorial integrity of the country, must immediately be embarked upon. In addition, India should not be allowed to get away with its continuous denial of the right to self-determination to the people of Kashmir. The present diplomatic initiative launched by the Indian government needs to be countered and countered effectively.

Spokesman Condemns Attacks on Soldiers in Somalia

BK2209121893 Islamabad Radio Pakistan Network in English 1100 GMT 22 Sep 93

[Text] Pakistan has condemned the cowardly attacks by supporters of Somali warlord General Aidid in Mogadishu yesterday, resulting in the killing of three Pakistani soldiers and injuring seven others. This brings to 32 the total number of Pakistani soldiers so far martyred while serving in the United Nations peace force. Briefing newsmen in Islamabad this afternoon, a Foreign Office spokesman expressed government's deep condolences with the families of the martyred soldiers who sacrificed their lives in the noble cause of restoring peace in a brotherly country. The spokesman said native Somalians have returned to their (?normalcy) but problem still remains in northern and southern Mogadishu which is controlled by the supporters of Gen. Aidid. He said the operations in Mogadishu have moved closer to the capture and punishment of

Gen. Aidid who is responsible for the criminal and premeditated acts on Pakistani soldiers.

Editorial Reiterates 'Unambiguous' Nuclear Stand

BK2209120393 Islamabad THE NEWS in English 21 Sep 93 p 7

[Editorial: "Nuclear Tangle"]

[Text] Reiterating Islamabad's position on nuclear non-proliferation in South Asia, Acting President Wasim Sajjad said on Sunday that Pakistan will not roll back its peaceful nuclear programme, nor accept any unilateral solution to the nuclear issue or the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR). While talking to newsmen in Islamabad, where he inaugurated the sixth meeting of the ICO [Islamic Conference Organization] standing committee on Scientific and Technological Cooperation, Mr Sajjad said that Pakistan will not sign the Nuclear non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) as long as India refuses to become a party to it. He said that Pakistan's stand on the nuclear issue was very clear and unambiguous, as evidenced by its numerous proposals on the issue, which included the idea of a nuclear free zone in South Asia. Pakistan needed nuclear technology for power generation and to meet energy shortfalls, said Mr Sajjad.

All the points made by the Acting President are well established elements of Pakistan's longstanding policy. At various forums and through different channels Islamabad has time and again made its position clear on the nuclear problem in South Asia: that this cannot be solved as long as Delhi continues to embrace grand nuclear designs, evident from its huge weapon oriented nuclear programme. The issue of the spread of nuclear missile technology in the region also grows out of Delhi's advanced programme to develop inter continental ballistic missiles.

It is strange, however, that most attempts by countries like the US, which aim at controlling the spread of nuclear technology in the region, have failed to take into account Delhi's nuclear misbehaviour. Instead they invariably tighten the screws on Islamabad, which has always advocated a comprehensive solution to the problems that dooms day weapons pose for regional peace. The recent decision of the Clinton administration in impose sanctions on both Pakistan and China, for the alleged violation of MTCR rules, reflects the same one-sided approach towards solving the nuclear conundrum that has not yielded any results. Despite repeated denials by both Islamabad and Beijing of the American charge that M-11 related technology allegedly shipped to Pakistan by China, violated any MTCR rules, a ban was imposed. Predictably, this provoked strong reaction from both countries which correctly saw this move as injudicious and unjust.

The US and other western countries which see South Asia as a potential flashpoint of nuclear conflict, have to convince India that any plan to defuse nuclear tensions here has to evolve from within the region. Any other attempt, which does not take into account the regional dynamics of the nuclear problem, such as Delhi's nuclear ambitions, its missile and rocket booster programme, and its impact on smaller countries' view of their security, is destined to failure. The Clinton Administration promises an even-handed approach to the problem. Now is the time to establish that evenhandedness, in policy rather than in declaratory statements.

Research Laboratory Develops Tank Equipment

BK2209123193 Rawalpindi NAWA-I-WAQT in Urdu 20 Sep 93 pp 1, 8

[Text] It has been learned from reliable sources that the research laboratory under Dr. Abdul Qadeer Khan—"Kahuta Research Laboratory"—has developed a "micro super computer" using its own resources. The prototype of the "micro super computer" was displayed to participants of the Islamic Conference Organization Standing Committee on Science and Technology conference on 19 September. This "micro super computer" is used in sensitive research activities. Meanwhile, the Pakistan Institute of Nuclear Science and Technology, a subsidiary of the Pakistan Atomic Energy Commission, has manufactured three new equipment parts to improve the combat capability of the Chinese T-59 tanks. These are "Laser Range (?Finder);" "Driver's Night Sight," equipment which helps the tank driver see targets at night; and "Gunner's Night Sight," equipment which enables the tank's gunner to fire on targets at night. All three equipment parts have been designed in Pakistan. According to reliable sources, the Pakistani Army has started purchasing these three equipment parts under the "T-59 upgrade" program to increase the number of T-59 tanks. The indigenous production of the equipment will enable Pakistan to save millions of rupees in foreign exchange. The equipment was displayed here on 19 September on the occasion of the science and technology conference. The equipment has been designed by eminent scientist Dr. Shaukat Hamid Khan.

Sri Lanka

Prohibited Zone Declared Along Northeast Coastline

BK1809113893 Colombo Sri Lanka Broadcasting Corporation International Service in English 1045 GMT 18 Sep 93

[Text] The government has declared a prohibited zone in the area between the coastline of the Trincomalee, Mullaitivu, Jaffna, Kilinochchi, and Mannar Districts and the corresponding Indo-Sri Lanka maritime boundary and the territorial seas of Sri Lanka. The establishment of this prohibited zone was promulgated by the government yesterday. The regulations stipulate that no one will be permitted to enter this prohibited zone in any boat or vessel within such zone for any purpose whatsoever except with the written authority of the competent authority. These regulations have repealed the emergency prohibition on the use of boat regulation Number 1 of 1993. [sentence as heard] The Foreign Ministry has announced that the regulations were promulgated for the protection and the security of the country in the context of the serious security situation prevailing in the Sri Lanka maritime waters in the north and east. It says the promulgation is

entirely consistent with international law. The Foreign Ministry points out that the government has taken into consideration the concern expressed by India and made specific provisions, recognizing the right of access to Kachchaitivu granted to Indian fishermen under the Indo-Sri Lanka Boundary Agreement of 1974 and 1976.

More on Assurance to India

BK1909111293 Colombo Sri Lanka Broadcasting Corporation International Service in English 1045 GMT 19 Sep 93

[Text] Sri Lanka has assured India that the government will take every possible measure to ensure the safety of Indian fishermen in the Palk Strait. A senior official source said in Colombo that Sri Lanka had clarified to India that the government's ban on boats and vessels in the north and the east territorial waters of Sri Lanka was a part of its military campaign against Tamil terrorists and there was no intention of subverting the boundary agreement with India. Naval craft patrolling the area will not attack any Indian fishing boats even in the sea around Kachchaitivu island, which is in Sri Lankan waters, the source said. Naval personnel have been instructed to be very cautious while approaching fishing boats and they will attack only the boats of the Tamil terrorists, he explained.

The government declared the entire north and east territorial waters of Sri Lanka a prohibited zone for any vessel, including fishing boats, on 3 September. On Friday, it was replaced by a new promulgation under emergency issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It has clearly defined the prohibited zone which has been established in the area between the coastline of administrative districts of Trincomalee, Mullaitivu, Jaffna, Kilinochchi, and Mannar and corresponding Indo-Sri Lanka maritime boundary and the territorial sea of Sri Lanka.